

F

1234

.K295



Class F1234

Book K295

PRESENTED BY

The Book of Red and Yellow

FRANCIS C. KELLEY



With Replies to John Lind
and Señor Enriquez



THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW

BEING A STORY
OF BLOOD AND A
YELLOW STREAK

56

1338

By
FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY

11



20-11943

CHICAGO

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1916

F1237
.K295

Copyright, 1915,
by
FRANCIS C. KELLEY
Chicago

*21
1915*
Pres. Darr. R. L. L. L.
gl. 1 '20

Press of
The Henry O. Shepard Co.
632 Sherman Street
Chicago

The Book of Red and Yellow

READERS of this book who have been following European war news will understand the reference to colors in the title. A friend suggested that I could appropriately call it "The Red Book," because it is a tale of blood. Another urged that "The Yellow Book" might be a better title, since it shows the yellow streak in human nature. Both suggestions appealed to me; but the using of both titles together seems better still. This book tells a tale of blood and shows the yellow streak in some human beings. The trail of the coward is over the perpetrators of the outrages which here are told. No one but a coward could take advantage of weakness and murder innocence. "The Book of Red and Yellow" expresses exactly what I want to express.



A few months ago strange rumors of outrages committed by the Constitutionlists in Mexico began to appear in American papers. The first inclination of practically all who read the items was to doubt; and the second inclination to shrug the shoulders and say: "Well, it's war." Even in Mexico itself, when the news of the horrors at Durango was received, Mexicans themselves charitably said to one another: "These things are the work only of irresponsible leaders and in one place. They do not imply that the Revolutionists have any such program in mind. Those who have done these fearful things will, in due time, be punished." But we were all wrong.

When Saltillo fell, the outrages were repeated. At Zacatecas they not only were repeated, but new infamies were added. At other cities, Zacatecas was outdone. Then the horrors were visited on every city and state taken by the Constitutionalist forces.

Some refugees from Mexico at last began to cross the American line. The border towns of Texas rapidly filled up with them. At Vera Cruz there were so many that they became a serious problem to the American authorities. Not only were officers of the Federal army, officials of the Huerta government and other political exiles among the refugees, but also priests who had never taken up arms or interfered in political matters, sisters whose lives had been given up to teaching the works of charity, brothers who had spent themselves on the education of the Mexican youth, bishops and archbishops. Over five hundred of these religious refugees came into the American lines. Most of them were destitute. Practically all had been robbed of everything they possessed. They told

of hardships, of murders, of crimes worse than murder, and of sacrileges. It was the men who heard these stories, many of them officers of the United States army and navy, who, shocked and outraged in their finer feelings, spread the awful news, which now began to reach the ears of the American people in all its repulsiveness.

It seemed, however, as if a conspiracy of silence had been organized. Reputable papers, supposed to be anxious to print the truth and to give the news, did neither. Statesmen, so-called, pooh-poohed everything. The man on the street said the thing was too horrible for credence. The wily politician saw danger; but all the time the people in Vera Cruz, who had hearts, saw red.



At last a pitiful appeal to charity, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to give asylum to the homeless, reached The Catholic Church Extension Society, chiefly through the efforts of the Rev. R. H. Tierney, Editor of *America*, and the Rev. H. A. Constantineau, Provincial Treasurer of the Oblate Fathers in San Antonio. It was plain to the directors of the Society that, if they could not do justice to these suffering exiles, they could, at least, be charitable to them. The Most Reverend James E. Quigley, D.D., Archbishop of Chicago, at once directed me, as President of the Society, to go wherever the refugees were, and use what funds were needed to assist them. I proceeded at once to Texas, saw the situation, relieved the immediate needs in San Antonio, El Paso, Laredo, Galveston, etc., and then started for Vera Cruz. Before taking the boat for that point, I learned by cable that, when the news of the impending evacuation of that port by the American troops was given out, all the refugees who could go had left for Cuba. I went to Havana instead of Vera Cruz, and found as many of these refugees in Cuba as we had in the United States, but in a far more deplorable condition. With the funds at my disposal, I spent what was needed, and came back to report to the Board of Governors of the Society and beg that more assistance be extended.

While in Texas I had the opportunity of hearing the stories of the refugees and investigating them. Knowing that there would be more of these stories in Cuba, I requested the Archbishop of New Orleans, who spoke Spanish and who had been a bishop in Porto Rico, to come with me. He kindly agreed to do this; and His Grace took especial care of the investigations, securing information which perhaps could never have been secured otherwise.



On my return to Chicago, the Society took further action and authorized me to pay the expenses incident to saving and helping the remaining

priests and sisters at Vera Cruz, should the Government fail to act favorably on the request of the refugees for transportation to Galveston. Our appeal to the charity of American Catholics has not been in vain, yet much still remains to be done. I publish this book in the hope that it will stir up even a greater manifestation of charity. The Board of Governors of the Society, relying on this, has authorized the publication. Our motives are purely charitable and humanitarian. The Society declines to enter into the discussion of these things except from that standpoint. We have no political axe to grind. We do not propose to attach blame to any one, much less to the administration now in power in Washington. If mistakes have been made, good-will may rectify them in part. If the President and his advisors have been deceived, one can readily understand that it was an easy matter to deceive them. They were not on the ground. No one can read this story without knowing that it was to the interests of some party or parties to lend themselves to such deception. That the deception was a crime every reasonable man and woman will concede; and the crime is all the clearer in that the sufferers have, as usual, been the innocent. If there were no refugees except political ones, we could be sorry for them; but we would be obliged to admit that chances must be taken in Mexican politics. The political refugees, however, formed the minority. Those who had committed no crime, and who had not mixed in political squabbles of any kind, had to suffer the most.

It will easily be understood that I can not give the names of persons and places referred to in many of the statements to follow. After reading the statements, and considering the conditions in Mexico, the reader will not wonder why, in the majority of instances, such details had to be left out. I do not care to sign death-warrants. But I have the original documents in my possession, or I know where they are, and have consulted them. They may be examined by those who have a right to see them and whose honesty in asking for them is beyond question.

I.

THE GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERSECUTION.

To begin I give a partial list of the outrages which have been committed in the name of "liberty" and the Constitution, by the men who claim to be fighting in Mexico for both. Not one single charge is overdrawn. I give them as they were given to me, not by a few individuals, but practically by all. I append proofs which can not be questioned.

FIRST.

The Constitutionals in Mexico have attempted to destroy, and practically have destroyed, three-fourths, if not more, of the Catholic Church in their country; which means that they have destroyed three-fourths of all the organized religious forces in Mexico. They did it deliberately, and as a result of a prearranged plan. They did it remorselessly and cruelly.

SECOND.

These same men drove out of Mexico, imprisoned or sent into hiding in fear of their lives, practically all the Catholic bishops in the Republic. Of those who remain, one alone is exercising his ministry unimpeded, because he is in the territory held by General Zapata, who is not and was not at any time subject to Carranza's authority. Of the others still on Mexican soil, three to my certain knowledge are in hiding, and one is in the penitentiary, sentenced to eight years' imprisonment for no crime whatever. To this charge may be added that of driving into exile priests and Sisters of Charity, religious men and women of all kinds, some of whom are Mexican citizens and some citizens of other nations.

THIRD.

These same men were guilty of seizing private property, even property held in the names of individuals, only because such property was used for religious purposes. They looted churches, destroyed libraries, scientific laboratories, colleges, schools, museums of Mexican archeology, valuable manuscripts and residences. They practically wiped off the map of Mexico her best institutions for higher education.

FOURTH.

They imprisoned, tortured and murdered priests and teachers.

FIFTH.

They committed most abominable and unspeakably vile outrages against the persons and virtue of young girls, good women, and Sisters whose lives had been vowed to the service of Almighty God.

SIXTH.

They interdicted practices of religion publicly under the penalty of death.

SEVENTH.

They usurped ecclesiastical jurisdiction by appointing to office, in what was left of the Church, such men as they pleased.

EIGHTH.

In order to carry these things out with some show of reason, they published the vilest lies against the Church and her clergy.

NINTH.

Proclaiming their desire for a free government under a constitution, they destroyed absolutely the liberty of the press, suppressing all newspapers and other publications not controlled and directed by themselves.

TENTH.

In various other ways they set aside the very Constitution to which they proclaimed allegiance, and set it aside deliberately.



Before taking up the discussion of these charges, a word about the Revolution itself. Porfirio Diaz had given peace to Mexico, but had ruled the country as a dictator. The rebellion against him by Francisco Madero was successful, and Madero himself was legally elected President of the Republic. It is probable that Madero was the first President really elected by the people themselves. If there were irregularities in his election, these irregularities could not have changed the result. Under Madero, an attempt was made to give Mexico a constitutional form of government, or rather to put the Constitution into effect for the first time. It was not an ideal constitution. The addition to it of the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez made it even less desirable. Neither of these were ideal democratic documents, but they were the law. The murder of Madero was a vile act, but it was never proven that Madero's successor, General Huerta, had been a party to that murder. Huerta himself was selected to succeed Madero in accordance with all the forms of law. He was a strong man, democratic, and fairly just. His government was a dictatorship like that of Diaz; but this much can be said of him: he could have brought peace to Mexico. He was prevented from doing this, however, by a new revolution headed by Governor Venustiano Carranza. The new revolution was fostered by influences from the United States. No revolution is possible in Mexico otherwise, since Mexico has no facilities for supplying arms and ammunition. All arms and ammuni-

tion for Carranza's outbreak were supplied by American firms, whose names are known, and who could easily have been prevented from supplying them. To end any revolution in Mexico, it is only necessary to forbid the sending of arms from the United States into that country. The Carranza forces had unlimited supplies, both of arms and money with which to buy them. They were successful, and were aided to their success by the closing of the port of Vera Cruz to Huerta. I do not question the right of our Government to close the port. Neither do I criticize the attitude of the administration to Huerta. I merely state the facts. On the face of things, it looked as if the people were fighting for constitutional government. I desire to show, in a general way in this chapter, how far the actions of the Constitutionalists agreed with their professions.



In the beginning, the outrages committed by Carranza's army were few, but at Durango it was clearly seen that the first step of the revolution was to be the utter destruction of religion. The Constitutionalists found at Durango a venerable and holy old man, who had long been the archbishop of that diocese. He was immediately arrested and from him was demanded a ransom of \$500,000. Now, the people of Mexico are not rich. The Church is not rich. There was no union between Church and State, and there had not been such a union for fifty years. The Constitutionalists might as well have asked the archbishop for \$500,000,000 as for \$500,000. He had not the money to give. He told his captors so. They flung him into prison. When they released him, it was only to keep him in durance within the city limits. They showered indignities upon his head. They arrested his clergy, exiled many, closed churches; in a word, they did all they could to stamp out religion in Durango. Some good people got together a few thousand dollars. Seeing that they could get no more, the Constitutionalists released the archbishop, but drove him out of the city. He went to Morelia, where again he was held for ransom, and again some good people bought his liberty. Then, after two months of this sort of thing, he escaped to the United States. I saw him, a sad old man, broken in health, but uncomplaining. Had I depended upon him for information, however, I would have had none. He suffered in silence, but I received the information from others, even those who were eye-witnesses of the affair.

Here is a statement by one of these eye-witnesses to the taking of the city of Durango by the Carranzista forces. I dare not give his name, for fear of the consequences to himself if he returns to Mexico:



No sooner were the Constitutionalists in the city, under the command of General Tomas Urbina, than there was a tremendous riot among them, and the second general in command was killed and a great number of others perished.

On hearing the first reports of the riot, crowds forced open the doors of all business houses, ransacking and setting fire afterward to them. Nine palaces and many houses were wiped out. Leading families who, previous to this horrible episode, had been considered rich, to-day have not even bread to eat, and many are without clothing.

The outrages committed did not cease at this point, but increased, and, on the second day, without court-martial, all the officials and chiefs taken during the battle or after were sentenced to death, thus disregarding entirely the guarantees and promises not to execute any one. Representatives of the leaders entered the archbishop's palace and other private homes, forcibly carrying with them those who had taken refuge there. Notwithstanding the entreaties of the sisters, mothers, wives and children, they were conducted as the vilest criminals to the dirtiest and unhealthiest prison cells. The day after they were compelled to beg from door to door the tremendous amount of money that had been demanded as ransoms. In the meantime other groups of armed men entered and profaned the Church of the Jesuit Fathers; *and the Carmelites were horribly insulted and outraged.* In the cathedral where the remains of the dead bishops and archbishops had been laid they scattered the remains with their swords. Not satisfied with this, they then approached the archbishop's palace, addressing the archbishop in very unbecoming language and demanded \$500,000 as a "loan," which amount he was unable to pay, and he was thereupon taken to jail, notwithstanding the fact that he was in an almost dying condition. Not even a chair or bed was given him, and he was left on the floor of the condemned cell.

These acts and others filled all the city with consternation, which increased by the hearing of other outrages which have been committed against families, and more especially so when priests were seen arrested for the mere fact of their profession and because they were unable to pay the money demanded of them.



What was done at Durango was the rule whenever the rebels conquered a new territory, and, when the payment of ransom was not sufficient, exile followed. Very early also in the conquests of the Constitutionalists came the same outrages in Matamoros. In both Durango and Matamoros the churches were pillaged, the desecrating of the graves of the dead bishops was done with the object of discovering if there might be some valuable objects buried with them. Swords were run through the disinterred bodies. That all this was premeditated and part of a plan, Carranza and the leaders themselves declared. In discourses published in their newspapers, they claimed that they intended to destroy militarism, capital and the clergy. It was in carrying out this plan that the cities were given to pillage, estates seized and religion trampled upon. It was a crime to have been a soldier in the Federal

army, to be a rich man, no matter how honestly the riches might have been gained, or to be a priest, teacher or Sister, no matter how much charity or good work had been done as such. There was no process of law. The Cathedral Chapters of Durango, Monterey, Zacatecas, Guadalupe, Puebla, etc., they dissolved by Constitutionalist authority.



The following statement, sworn to by the writers before a notary, gives an idea of the way the persecution was carried on in the north.

From its very beginning the Constitutionalist Revolutionary Party of Mexico showed itself to be anti-religious, as is proven by the injustices committed in the State of Sonora, Sinaloa and Chihuahua against priests and church property. But not in the degree that it afterward attained. Don Venustiano Carranza, who never before had shown signs of "clerophobia," allowed himself, according to our belief, to be influenced by certain members of what is known in Mexico as the "Reform Party," the same that tried to force Francisco I. Madero into a religious persecution. From then on, the irreligious spirit of the Constitutionalist revolution appeared unmasked.

We shall say nothing of what preceded the taking of Monterey from lack of concrete data sufficiently authenticated.

MONTEREY.—They took Monterey, the capital of the State of Nuevo Leon, on April 24, 1914. According to the general custom, the Revolutionary officials left the churches undisturbed, but on the 27th of the same month they ordered all churches closed, and took possession of the keys. On May 12 the priests were cited to appear. Accordingly the Vicar-General, sixteen foreign and several Mexican priests went to the place appointed, where a "loan" of \$500,000 was demanded of them. As they declared themselves unable to give such an immense sum, they were put in prison. By the intervention of their respective consuls, the foreigners were set free, but at the same time declared banished from Mexican soil. The Vicar-General and the other Mexican priests remained in jail.

The archbishop's palace was occupied by the rebels, who destroyed a magnificent library and possessed themselves of the archives of the archdiocese. The printing-press of the archbishopric was taken over for the publication of the impious newspaper, *El Bonete*, in the pages of which were published, in an attempt to dishonor the priesthood, the documents found in the secret archives. (Records of diocesan disciplinary cases.—Ed.)

On June 7 they publicly burned the confessionals and other church furniture. They also publicly profaned the statues of the saints in the streets, casting lots on them and shooting at those which by lot were determined as "Huertistas." There were, moreover, numerous spoliation, robberies and other excesses committed in the churches.

As a climax to these infamous proceedings, the Governor of the State issued a decree, under date of July 14, in which, after an introduction very offensive to the clergy, which he designated as "corrupt and corrupting," religious liberty was practically abolished.

In several towns of this State were committed acts of sacrilegious savagery. In Tanquecillos, for example, they profaned the sacred vestments, using them for a dance. At Margaritas, the Ciborium of the Tabernacle was used in drinking "mescal." At Cerralbo they took the statues of the saints, not excepting that of the national devotion, Our Lady of Guadalupe, and cast them into a well, mutilating that of Our Lady of Lourdes to make it small enough to be forced in, at the same time issuing a decree in which it was declared that anyone caught trying to rescue the statues would be summarily executed. In Las Aldamas the churches were converted into barracks. A certain Father Regalado was obliged to walk a distance of about eighty miles, from Linares to Victoria. Another priest, Father Martin, parish priest of Galeana, was robbed of all he had, and it was only by fleeing to the mountains that he freed himself from still worse treatment.

TEPIC.—The city of Tepic, capital of the territory by that name, was captured in the middle of May. They imprisoned the bishop, Rt. Rev. Andres Segura, and Very Rev. Ramon Vilalto, Superior of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, in the penitentiary about the 17th of the same month, sentencing them to eight years' imprisonment. Other priests were left at liberty, although forbidden to leave the city. That, at least, was the belief at first, but now we know that all the Missionary Fathers of the Heart of Mary residing there are actually in prison.

SALTILLO.—This city, capital of Coahuila, fell into the hands of the Revolutionists in the beginning of June, if we are not mistaken. It is impossible to describe what the priests suffered there. Eight of them (four Jesuits, three Eudists and a Benedictine) were shut up in a dark room, and kept there eight days. Then, at midnight the door was opened, and they were told they were condemned to death. One by one they were taken out, and with each of them a mock execution was carried out in the minutest details — the line of sharpshooters, the signal to fire, the discharge and even the falling of the body, which was produced by a push from behind. Afterward they were taken in a stock car to Torreon, where they were shamefully paraded through the streets; and from there they were taken through Ciudad Juarez to the border. We have been told that other priests were forced to suffer the torment of the gallows, being tied by the neck and lifted into the air. One of them was raised thus three times, until he lost consciousness.

ZACATECAS.—This is the capital of the state of the same name, and was taken June 3 at sundown. Immediately after they captured Rev. Inocencio Lopez Velarde, who was a Fiscal Promoter, Professor of the Seminary and Chaplain of the Theresian Sisters, and after robbing him, took him to the outskirts of the city and killed him, afterward maltreating his dead body, which was found the next day, the head and chest riddled with bullets. On the 4th, early in the morning, they went to the College of the Christian Brothers, and took away its chaplain, Father Pascual Vega, and Brothers Adrian and Adolph, president and vice-president, respectively. All three were conducted to Bufa Hill and shot. No one in the city knew where they were till on the third day their bodies were found half-buried. The other brothers were sent to prison and subjected to

a thousand indignities. On the 25th all the priests of the cities were cited to appear. Twenty-three priests, headed by the Vicar-General, presented themselves. They were menaced with death if they would not give on the same day before 6 P.M. a "loan" of \$1,000,000, and were incarcerated in a miserable dungeon. There they were kept three days without food or drink and in danger of asphyxiation. In the afternoon of that day the "loan" was demanded, they took out the Vicar-General and another priest, pretending that they were to be shot, and at the same time threatening the others with a like punishment if they would not quickly give the sum demanded. Knowing very well that it was impossible for them to collect such a fabulous amount, especially if they kept them locked up, the Revolutionists allowed three of them to go out, and they were able to get together \$14,000. The rebels took this sum, but ordered them to continue their begging among the faithful until they collected at least \$100,000. They did so, but they were told that \$4,000 was missing, and obliged them to go out again and collect that sum, but they were not even then set at liberty. They were kept in jail until the night of July 3, when they were taken to the depot and put in a dirty box-car and sent to Torreon and Ciudad Juarez, guarded by a convoy of drunken soldiers, who were constantly menacing them with their guns. There they were despoiled of all they had and were obliged to take refuge in the United States. The Episcopal palace was changed into a barracks.

A brutal deed was perpetrated at Villa de Guadalupe. Father Valeriano Medina, a charitable priest, was taking care of the wounded in the parish school, which he had converted into a hospital. The Revolutionists entered the house on horseback, killing some of the patients with their horse's hoofs, and taking the others out to be shot. The Father, who was the especial object of these outlaws' search, escaped. The parish priest of Cabra, Rev. Jesus Alba, was taken to the cemetery and killed.

AGUASCALIENTES.—The capital of the state of that name, was taken shortly after Zacatecas, and all the priests exiled. On the 4th of August, the confessionals and some statues of saints were publicly burned. Governor Fuentes threatened with death any priest who would attempt to exercise his ministry.

SAN LUIS POTOSI.—July 17 they peacefully entered San Luis Potosi, capital of the state of that name. Nevertheless, this was one of the cities in which the clergy had to suffer most. On the 19th, they asked the Vicar-General for the bishop's carriage, and Col. Alberto de Avila struck him and put him in prison. Thanks to the German consul, he was liberated in two hours.

On the 20th an order was published forbidding the celebration of Mass on week days under penalty of \$1,000 fine for the first offense, \$2,000 for the second, \$3,000 for the third, and either exile or death for the fourth. Confession, outside the danger of death, was prohibited, and even then only with a government official present to hear. Ringing of the bells was to be confined to secular uses.

On July 25 a proclamation of exile for all priests was published, ordering them to be at the depot at five o'clock next morning. They complied, but had to wait until six in the evening, when the Carranzistas appeared. They allowed ten priests to remain for services in the city,

and one other because he was sick. The other twenty-seven were put into a stock car and thus taken to Charcas. Here they were taken out, made to look into some wells, and threatened with being thrown into them. Then they took them to a hacienda and enclosed them in a sacristy, the walls of which were bespattered with human blood. After three days they relieved them of all they had. They detained the bishop's secretary, the first assistant of Del Sagrario parish, and a Franciscan monk. The others were freed on condition that they leave the country. They arrived at Monterey, via Saltillo, on July 31. Here the Vicar-General, Very Rev. Agustin Jimenez was detained. The others were again arrested, and taken under a guard to Nuevo Laredo, with orders to shoot anyone trying to escape. Then their photographs were taken, as if they were criminals, and they were obliged to cross the border. Among the exiles was Rev. Fr. Espinosa, a venerable Franciscan, ninety-four years of age.

The magnificent Episcopal palace was sacked, and the books of its library sold at ridiculous prices. We hear, however, that an Englishman claimed the palace and everything contained therein as his own, and that it was turned over to him.

QUERETARO.—This city, capital of the state of that name, was taken by the Carranzistas on the 29th of July. The same day Fathers Gabriel Goray, a Carmelite, and Sousa, a Franciscan, were kept in the De la Cruz barracks two days, and then driven through the streets on horseback, vested in their religious habits. Then they liberated the latter and made the former enter the army. The churches were all closed, the Revolutionists keeping all the keys, except those of the churches San Jose and Santa Clara, which were deposited in the Spanish vice-consulate. In this vice-consulate several Spanish priests took refuge, and others hid themselves in various disguises. On the 30th or 31st the Catholic high school was attacked, and the Christian Brothers and the French vice-consul taken out by armed force. On the 3d of August the Seminary was changed into a Constitutionalist police station. On the 8th the confessionals were burned in Zena Garden. Father Rabago was imprisoned and Canon Florencio Rosas put in charge of the diocese of Queretaro. On the 11th they attacked the vice-consulate, taking prisoners the priests hidden there. These were taken at bayonet point to the barracks De la Alameda, thence to Griega, afterward back to the same barracks, and finally set free. On the 27th a large Catholic manifestation caused great fear among the Revolutionists. They exiled all the Spanish priests on the 29th, taking them to San Luis Potosi, where they were detained until September 12 and then sent to Laredo. The others were obliged to appear in the former bank of San Luis in order to declare what goods they possessed, how they acquired them and what were the possessions of the diocese.

GAUNAJUATO.—On the 31st of July almost all the cities of this very rich state were captured. In the capital, on the 1st of August, "loans" were forced, heavier ones on priests than others. After a few days all the priests were convoked and told that confession was absolutely prohibited, even to the dying, and that any commission of ladies asking for repeal of these laws would not be received.

LEON.—Although they entered this town July 31, they were expelled the next day by Pascual Orozco; but regained it on August 2. They imposed on the bishop a "loan" of \$500,000, and, as his representatives could not collect more than \$6,000 they took possession of the stipends and goods of the clergy. The canons were arrested and imprisoned in their own houses. Foreign priests were expelled. They prohibited the ringing of church bells and drove out the nuns from the convents.

IRAPUATO.—Here the confessionals were burned August 3; confession was prohibited under pain of death, and nuns exiled. They tried to kill the parish priest and Father Chavez.

SILAO.—They arrested all the priests, and, on giving them their freedom, they kept as hostages the parish priest and another Father whom they robbed, even of the dinner and supper their families brought them.

CELAYA.—The Missionary Sons of the Heart of Mary hid themselves in near-by farms. The Archbishop of Michoacan, Most Rev. Leopoldo Ruiz, who happened to be there, hid himself in the home of a Catholic gentleman. The other priests hid in different houses in the city. One of the fugitives betrayed the others, telling where they were concealed, and all were captured. The Archbishop, Father Penaflor, a Franciscan, and Father Lara, a parish priest, were especially sought after. Thanks to the courage of Mr. C——, who was on the point of being shot three or four times for not telling where His Grace was concealed, he was able to save himself by flight to a hacienda. Some others were also able to remain in hiding. Those who were imprisoned, in number about twenty-five, as they were unable to pay the \$60,000 demanded, were exiled; being taken to Laredo in a filthy stock car.

ZAMORA.—It seems that in this town the venerable Archbishop of Durango was imprisoned, and with all his priests compelled to sweep the streets. He was taken, guarded and on foot, to Piedad, and from there by train to Irapuato, August 27, according to the account of an eyewitness.

TOLUCA.—The Revolutionists entered this city, the capital of the State of Mexico, on August 8. On the 10th they closed all the churches, keeping the keys themselves, and they have not been opened until the present day. They laughed at a commission of Catholics who asked permission to have Mass, saying they would allow it if for each mass they paid them \$300,000. The Sacraments and all public worship were prohibited. They arrested Fathers Garduño, Campos, Orhalas and Joaquin. The Passionist Fathers, nine in number, whose hiding-places were discovered, were taken prisoners and incarcerated for fifteen days; then permitted to go to the Spanish vice-consulate on the express condition that they would leave the Republic within fifteen days. Because he would not disclose the hiding-place of the Holy Cross Fathers, Brother Mariano Gonzales, of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, was shot.

The Church of Carmen was plundered, a very large and beautiful statue of the Sacred Heart chopped to pieces, and the sacred vessels, jewels and ornaments of the statues stolen. They also sacked the Church of La Merced and were engaged in burning various things taken therefrom until eleven at night.

In nearly the whole city of Toluca there was no priest to baptize, for all were in hiding.

Finally Father Paredes tried to make some arrangement, but was able to obtain absolutely nothing. Before this a decree was published, which reached even the absurdity of prohibiting fasting and mortification, etc.

MEXICO.—In the capital of the Government religion has relatively suffered less. However, Father Paredes was set up as Vicar-General. About thirty priests have been arrested, and some of them beaten. For example, Father Zaragoesa. The House of Retreat of the Angels was changed to a barracks, and the confessionals of its Oratory burned in the streets. The Church of St. Bridget was closed and the Carranzistas took possession of the rectory, etc.

PUEBLA.—In this, the capital of the state, Father Escobedo was placed as administrator of the diocese. They dissolved the Cathedral Chapter and exiled its members; the confessionals of many of the churches were taken away and stored in a cellar. The places in the cathedral formerly occupied by the confessionals were marked with secret society emblems. The pulpit of the cathedral was declared open to all. A decree was published suppressing confession. A dance was held in the chapel of the Catholic College of the Jesuits. By another decree all religious were expelled. They took possession of De la Salle College and others. They made a barracks of the Episcopal palace, etc.

VERA CRUZ.—The capital of this state being protected by American troops, all has been peaceful there, but in some cities of the state atrocities have been perpetrated.

At Tepozotlan they stole the ciborium, dropping the Sacred Hosts on the floor, and not permitting them to be gathered up until two days later.

At Jalapa all priests were expelled, being given twenty-four hours to leave.

In Cordoba all the churches were taken possession of and a decree of expulsion against all priests was published.

Orizaba fell into the hands of the Carranzistas August 24. Four days after all nuns were expelled. Afterward, by proclamation, all priests were banished and the churches closed; all except that of El Calvario, for fear of the people. Mass, however, was not allowed to be said there.

The above statements give a very general idea of the persecutions. In the chapters to follow a few statements more in detail are given.

II.

GUADALAJARA.

This statement I print in full. To attempt to compress it would be to destroy its force. It was written by an exile who suffered the horrors of the persecution himself. Were I to take the facts as a basis for writing the story myself I would, at the same time, take a note of personal experience out of it, which could only destroy some of the vividness of the sad narration.

"After a weak show of resistance and a sham battle on the outskirts of the city, Huerta's troops abandoned the city of Guadalajara in the night between the 7th and 8th of July, 1914. During the sortie the inefficient General Mier was killed and his small army scattered. At the same time the army of General Obregon entered the city by detachments. They met no resistance from the inhabitants, but were acclaimed by a number of ragged workingmen and some revolutionists of the city. Up to this time it was thought that the Huerta newspapers were libeling his opponents and that the Obregonistas were not as barbarous as the Villistas and their kind. The invaders themselves declared that the city of Guadalajara would be convinced that the Constitutionalist cause was that of peace and justice; and they ordered the motto of Juarez to be engraved over the door of every school: 'Respect for the rights of others is peace.' The irony of this motto is great. Scarcely had the Constitutionlists entered the city when they confiscated all the automobiles. They began with that of the archbishop, which Obregon appropriated for himself. They took all the carriages and fine horses. The officers broke into the houses of the well-to-do, whether they were at home or away. They camped there and parceled out among themselves and their women and friends the furniture, table service, and even the clothes of the women and children of the house. They searched everywhere for the officials of the Huerta government, for the principal employees of that government, for the members of the Catholic party and for every one whom they considered political enemies. A number of these were shot, some with the greatest cruelty.



"General Obregon managed to restrain individual outrages of his soldiers, but the pillage went on unchecked in other forms as violent and as criminal. The barracks were left empty, while the troops were purposely lodged in the most flourishing and best-kept institutions of learning and charity. On July 9 a picket of soldiers was placed at all the doors of

the Jesuit College. This is the best in the city, and possesses a fine equipment of physical and chemical apparatus from Europe. The rector had just left the classrooms on the first floor, when a band of Yaqui Indians, bedecked with feathers, entered and camped with their women in the clean and elegant lecture-rooms. Colonel Calderon, one-time school-master and afterward an inmate of San Juan de Ulua prison, and now a shining light in the Constitutionalist army, although without any education and evidently without principle, took for himself the rector's room and quartered his officers and musicians in the upper stories. He refused to listen to protests. He made no effort to stop the destruction of scientific instruments which was going on, nor did he respect the French flag which hung above the door of the building. Only one who has seen it can picture a barracks in Mexico. It is a mass of human bodies, filthy men, women and children, who cook their meals, make their beds, wash their clothes and bathe themselves in view of all. They live with all their instruments, arms, playthings and animals heaped around them.

"As the spoliation was to be accomplished by degrees, the rector was allowed a miserable lodging in the barracks, which he had to accept, unless he wished to sleep in the street. For several days he was not allowed to pass out the door of his own house. Colonel Calderon's troops are the most moral, if there can be any morality among soldiers where the petty thefts of the enlisted men are punished by death, while wholesale thefts are committed with impunity by the officers. Calderon's troops are composed of full-blood Yaquis, who possess a religion of a kind, in that they carry pictures and medals of saints on their hats and show respect toward churches and priests. On this account the Constitutionlists dissemble the war which they are making on religion by leading the Indians to think that they are pursuing, not their beloved priests, but one Mr. Clergyman (Don Clero), whom they portray as the worst of criminals. The Yaquis showed respect to the Jesuit priests who continued to live among them. The Indians did not destroy the furniture and apparatus except after the example of some of the officers who came there.

"The other colleges suffered even a worse fate. The ecclesiastical seminary, which is one of the finest buildings in the city, was occupied by troops and horses the same day that the Jesuit College was entered. At once officers and soldiers began to sack it. They threw the books out of the windows or sold them for 10 cents a volume to any one who would buy. Still worse was the occupation of the College of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart. This is an English establishment. But the consul protested in vain, and the flag of that country was not respected. The most shameless troops, with their women and horses, took possession of the

beautiful garden of the nuns. The women camp-followers afterward entered the sleeping apartments of the Sisters and stole the clothes of the nuns and their pupils. They dressed themselves up in these, or sold the finest clothes and furniture for a pittance and destroyed what they could not use or sell. The sick and wounded were placed in the infirmary of the college, notwithstanding that there was no need of it, because there was plenty of room in the hospitals. The soldiers and their shameless women went to bed in the rooms of the Sisters and pupils. The teachers and children had fled the evening before at the approach of the bandits.



"It can not be said that these outrages were committed only by the soldiers, and without the knowledge or consent of the so-called Generals Obregon, Lucio Blanco, Rafael Buelma, Benjamin Hill, and the pretended Governor, M. M. Dieguez. The last-named was once a miner at Cananea and a resident for several years in San Juan de Ulua prison on account of a mine theft committed by him at Cananea. These were the men who, for the purpose of uplifting society, advancing civilization and spreading the sciences, preferred to leave the many barracks and other available public buildings unoccupied and to lodge their troops in these centers of learning. These were the men who commanded the flags of foreign nations to be taken down from the houses and who threatened the consuls who dared defend their countrymen or who would attempt to appeal at any time to Mexico City or Washington. These Constitutionalist leaders were informed and led by the secret society members of the place, who are more intelligent but not less savage than themselves, and who advised them to levy their heaviest tolls on Catholics and to imprison, as they did, the priests and other persons whom they pointed out as enemies deserving to be shot. These Constitutionalist leaders are the very men who closed all the courts, so that nobody could defend his rights. They destroyed all means of communication, so that they would not have to obey any one, even Carranza himself. Finally they got a woman of the underworld, a notorious character called Atala Apodaca, to proclaim war unto death upon the Catholic priests. And they published the vilest attacks and the grossest calumnies in two or three miserable sheets, which were the only papers they allowed to be circulated.

"At first they did not persecute the priests so violently. But before long the mask dropped from their faces. They faked a plot of the clergy which had for its object to make the people rise against the new government. On July 21 Governor Dieguez gave an order forcibly to arrest all the priests of the city and to take possession of all the churches. Soldiers were let loose in detachments of fifty. They went through the whole city and arrested not only the priests, but also the sextons and even persons

found praying in the churches. They took the Marist Brothers, with many boys who were at play in the college. They arrested a number of servants, and even some seamstresses, whom they accused of having made mustaches and beards to disguise the priests. The poor prisoners were forced to pass the night in the barracks, cooped up in foul-smelling cells, where they had to stand or to sit among drunken soldiers, who pointed their guns at them and brutally threatened and vilely insulted them. The prisoners were stripped of everything — money, watches, books, and even glasses. Among them were sick people who were brought in on cots. These were simply the orders of Governor Dieguez, which were carried out by his bloodthirsty troops. They were eager to shoot, without investigation, any one whom a drunken or furious officer might point out.

“The following day they filled the Escobedo prison with more than one hundred and twenty priests of all nationalities. Among them was the Bishop of Tehuantepec, Rt. Rev. Ignacio Plasencia, who was visiting in the city. The accusers did not even know the names of the prisoners. Three improvised courts made ridiculous the forms of justice. They afterwards declared that ‘no cause was found for proceeding against the defendants’ (*no haber habido causa para proceder en contra*). Meanwhile the prisoners were kept isolated (*incomunicado*) in the dungeons for six or seven days, against all the laws of the country. To inquiries by friends as to what offense they had committed or what charge there was against them, the only answer was ‘these are the orders of General Dieguez.’



“The Catholics of the city were in consternation. There would have been an uprising, except for the fear that the innocent prisoners would be shot. There was no service on Sunday, nor were the bells rung. The churches were not opened during these days, except to save the Sacred Hosts such as had not been profaned. These had been picked up and removed (*recogidas*) by pious women. Meantime the Constitutionals took advantage of these days to invade the churches. They profaned them with their troops and women. They stole everything of value in some of them. And they searched for arms and cannon which they said were hidden there. They even opened and profaned the graves and announced that they had found bodies of persons assassinated by the clerical party, together with the arms which they had hidden there. All that they really did find was thirty or more old guns which had been bought for 25 cents each by the Marist Brothers for the military drills of their students. The Constitutionals celebrated this find as a victory, and made vague assertions about having found even a cannon and dynamite bombs in nobody-knows-what hiding-place of the priests. They

kept up these charges until they made themselves ridiculous. Then they abandoned them for others equally false and such as could be invented only by wild men. A week later, when Obregon returned from Colima, they began to set the priests free without any more order or judgment than was shown before. They were allowed to depart, minus the money which had been stolen from them in part or altogether in the various places where they had been.

"The Jesuits did not return to their college, because they were forbidden to. Moreover, the officers and soldiers had cleaned out everything of use to themselves. They had even gone so far as to sell to any one who wished to buy costly scientific apparatus for which they took a dollar or two. Colonel Calderon, who was careful under other circumstances, now showed that his sectarianism was equal to his lack of culture. He had promised to protect the library and scientific laboratories. For fifteen days he had lived with the Jesuits. During that time he was convinced that they were honorable gentlemen. But to no avail. Calderon let them be thrown into prison as common criminals. Not only did he not protest himself, but he paid no attention to the protest of some of his officers and almost all of the soldiers. The college was occupied thenceforth by a guard of soldiers, and the musicians and their families. No protection was afforded the college, either by the captain who was sick there, or by Dieguez, to whom notice was given, or by Secretary Berlanga, who, with cynicism, had come some days before to see for himself the fine equipment and perfect arrangement of the physical and chemical and natural-history laboratories and the library. Finally, August 3, the college building was confiscated, with all that it contained, without allowing the priests to take even their personal effects or clothes.



"Many of the professors in the colleges of the Jesuit Fathers, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart and the Marist Brothers were Mexicans. But most of them were foreigners who had come to Mexico to supply the lack of Mexicans in these congregations. And, so as to destroy them with less trouble, the Constitutionlists made up their minds to banish the foreign priests and professors from Guadalajara. In order to suppress the college of the nuns, all they had to do was to take away the building and steal or destroy everything in it.

"August 5, Mr. Lobato, mayor of the city (*presidente del ayuntamiento*), who is a man of some education, but with rabid anti-Catholic notions, directed the foreign consuls to call their nationals among the priests and professors to the city hall (*palacio de ayuntamiento*) in order to define to them their situation. About forty-eight gathered there. He marched them through the streets to the government palace (*palacio del*

gobierno) to hear the orders of Dieguez. The Governor did not show himself. He is an uncouth person, who does not know how to talk. Instead, his secretary, M. Aguierre Berlanga, appeared. He is as small in mind as he is in body. If he knows how to write, certainly he can not speak or appear to advantage before people. He spoke in the name of Dieguez. He said that, although most were innocent, nevertheless for political reasons the Governor would banish them in three days from Mexican soil. They all protested against such a flagrant violation of the Constitution and the international laws committed by these very persons who called themselves Constitutionalists. The application of the thirty-third article of the Constitution — namely, the expulsion of “pernicious” foreigners without formal trial, is reserved to the President of the Republic alone. They appealed to Carranza and to all the foreign consuls. But no attention was paid to anybody, nor were telegrams allowed to be sent. The foreigners were compelled to leave by the port of Manzanillo, although that port was still occupied by Federals. To their protests, Dieguez replied that the Constitutionalists would be in possession of the port in three days and that the exiles meantime could wait any place they pleased, even in the field of battle, until the way should be cleared. As the foreigners were Europeans, they asked Dieguez to delay the banishment until the road to Vera Cruz should be opened, because Carranza was on the point of entering Mexico and it would be less expensive for all of them to leave the country by this road. Dieguez replied that they must leave by way of Manzanillo, in spite of its unhealthy climate. From there they might go any place they chose. He would do no more than put them on a ship. He would not give them any assistance for the journey. All that he would grant was five days, without any extension of time. Since Dieguez is as stupid as he is fanatical, the decent people of Guadalajara could not impress upon him the barbarity of this banishment by way of Manzanillo nor the need of assistance felt by these men who had been robbed of everything they possessed, nor the violation of all law and justice which he was committing against all foreign nations by forbidding them communication with their consuls in Mexico or the United States.

“On August 10 the foreign priests and professors were given an hour’s notice to be at the railroad station. The purpose of the short notice was to prevent the people of the city from gathering to bid them farewell. They were threatened with prison or death if they delayed. Soldiers were waiting for them in the station. There also were a number of Constitutionalists, secret service members, and a band of music. Like a tiger lapping the blood of its victim and roaring with delight over the dismembered body, Dieguez ordered the band to play the hymn of

Juarez and, after other such pieces, as the train pulled out, 'la Golandrina.' The Catholics and pupils of the exiles who crowded the station, having come to bid them an affectionate farewell, wept with grief and indignation. The priests also wept to see so many good people in Mexico victims of a few bandits. They were somewhat consoled with the hope that their own woes would cease when they should arrive among people who could better appreciate their science and virtue. But their cares were not to cease there. The guard which accompanied them had orders to leave them at the end of the road, even though it were in the line of fire between Federals and Constitutionalists. When they arrived at Colima, Governor Ruiz, who was more humane than Dieguez, knowing that the road was not open and that there was no food on the way, and that to abandon the exiles there would be to condemn them to death, gave orders to keep them all night in the station in the car in which they arrived. The following day he took their names, because in Guadalupe even this much had not been done. Governor Ruiz informed them that they would continue to be prisoners, but he gave them permission to live in the city, with the city limits as their prison walls. He allowed them to lodge wherever they could, and made them pay their own expenses, besides requiring them to report daily at the police headquarters.



"When the Constitutionalists entered Manzanillo, which was not until some days afterward, the big chief Dieguez wanted to send the forty-seven foreigners away at once, without giving a thought as to whether there was a train, a ship or lodging and food in Manzanillo. August 20 he gave orders for all to be in the station. It was known there that there was no train; but the passengers were kept in ignorance until midday. The governor knew all day there was no train. But he was feasting in a neighboring plantation. He said to his military aide, Lepe, that he would punish them with one day of Constitutionalist camp life. For fifteen hours they waited for the train and almost suffocated with the heat. At night the Governor arrived and ordered the train to start. But the English consul, and the German consul who himself was being expelled, and the Spanish consul, all pointed out that in Manzanillo there was neither food nor ship, and they prevailed on Dieguez to let them wait in Colima until some steamship should arrive.

"Eight days more the exiles waited for a ship. They lived on the charity of the good citizens of Colima and especially on the alms of the priests of this diocese who, unconscious of themselves, displayed wonderful charity. On the twenty-ninth of August came a new order to depart, because a ship was soon expected. Since now Carranza had

established his government in Mexico and since he had promised the United States to respect the persons and property of foreigners, the governor was asked that they be allowed to receive orders from Carranza or from the foreign ministers in the capital, to the effect that they might sail from Vera Cruz, or at least that their passage be paid from Manzanillo. But Governor Ruiz would neither do nor allow anything of the kind. He who was living in a house he had stolen, and he who ate and slept in another's home, need have little care for unhappy exiles. He said that there was a ship at Manzanillo and meantime they would be lodged in the hotel recently confiscated from D. Blas Ruiz. But this lodging, during the three days they had to stay in Manzanillo, consisted only of the choice of the floor for a bed or some rooms which had been wrecked in a filthy, abandoned hotel. On the floor below were lodged the troops and on that above the officers and some shameless women. The port, which had lately been abandoned by several thousand Federals, had been cleaned out of all provisions. As a climax to the outrages suffered by the priests, they were denied permission in that hot climate even to bathe in the sea. To add to their woes and to share them, fifty nuns, Ladies of the Sacred Heart, who had been deceived by the promise of a ship, were set down without protection in this hell-hole. The only hope which the Mexican government offered to the one hundred persons whom it had proscribed was to suggest to them the ship Bonita, in which one hundred Constitutionlists were to be carried to Mazatlan and in which it was said there was scarcely room for eight persons more. And this took place while Carranza and Dieguez allowed a shipload of Chinese to disembark at Manzanillo. Surely the Chinese were an advantageous exchange for so many religious teachers who were being exiled for no other crime than that of having consecrated their lives to the welfare of the Mexican people; to teach them a religion which forbids robbery even under the Constitutionalist name of loot (*avance*), a religion which teaches the people the difference between right and wrong, in order that they may not be the playthings of anti-Christian atheists and political bandits, a religion which teaches the Mexican people to exercise their rights as citizens and to demand for Catholics that religious liberty which the so-called Laws of Reform, to the destruction of civilization, deny them. Yet these Constitutionlists permit the Mormons, the Chinese and the Hindus to practice their religion and morality. There is plenty of liberty in Mexico for the association of prostitutes, and yet not enough liberty to permit three Catholic women to associate for the purpose of teaching little girls Mathematics and English. What crime have the Constitutionlists found in these latter? None. They themselves are now ashamed of the fable which they invented of a plot and of

arms. But we are wrong. They accuse them of having written over the doors of their houses 'obscene' words such as '*Ave Maria Purissima*,' of having written upon their walls the name of Jesus, of having read in their churches the pastoral letters of their bishops.

"But these Constitutionalists, who have written over the doors of the schools the motto of Juarez, 'Respect for the rights of others is peace'; these men who at the same time open stores to sell their loot, which they have stolen from individuals and Catholic schools; these men whose only thought is to rob peaceful citizens in order to enrich themselves, what do they know or care for the rights of others or for peace? These men, who destroy all the schools and force the children to listen to the lessons of an ignorant, bloodthirsty and immoral woman, like Atala Apodaca and admirers of her, like Valencia and Ortega, what appreciation have they of the right of freedom of education which the Constitution of Mexico itself guarantees?



"What crime have the priests committed; what fault have they been guilty of that secret societies and the revolution hate them so? The Jesuits had the misfortune to have accredited their schools and colleges and to have shown the inferiority and disorder of the government system. They have committed the fault of educating the more cultured class of society and of having merited the esteem of these because of their faithful service and modesty in that work. They have committed the fault of being taken for rich men and of having received the sons of rich men. What matters it that nearly one-fourth of their pupils could not, on account of their poverty, pay even one-half of the small tuition which was asked? 'You are immensely rich,' repeated the parrot Dieguez, when the Rector of the college went to ask permission to get his clothes. An educated person would have tried to find out the truth. The Jesuits are not a business concern, which combines its interests for trade. Their constitution requires complete financial independence in all their houses. One house can not assist another to any considerable extent. Thus there are houses that are rich, and there are colleges that are poor and even poverty-stricken. The latter might fail and the Order could not help them. Each college and institution must live on its own resources and for the benefit of the community in which it is located. The College of Guadalajara did not even have its own building. And the scientific apparatus and furniture were not paid for, but were owed for to the extent of \$70,000 which is still due various Mexicans and foreigners. This is the wealth which 'was being sent to Europe.' These are the millions which they put in their banks.

"The crimes of the Marist Brothers were of the same kind and their

wealth the same. They taught commercial courses and the elementary branches better than the atheist teachers, and their pupils finished their studies better educated, more industrious and more moral than those of their enemies. Secret society fanaticism and Mexican constitutionalism could not stand the scientific and moral superiority of the Catholics, and they preferred to bury the people in ignorance by leaving them without teachers, which they confess they lack, rather than allow 'these pernicious foreigners' to teach them.



"And what was the crime of the Salesian Fathers? They occupied a large building, still unfinished and unpaid for, where they taught the arts and crafts to the children of the common people. They had the very best tools and machinery for carpentry, bookbinding, printing, shoe-making, and the like. They committed the crime of teaching, practically for nothing, trades whereby the sons of the poor workingman would be enabled to earn an honest living. These are the things for which they were hated by these infamous bandits, who claim to work in behalf of the people and yet who have never been able to establish a single school of this kind for the people. These pretenders were ashamed to let a foreigner inspect their poor imitations of industrial schools. Nor will they try to run these machines, which they do not understand, and which they have stolen from their legitimate owners.

"The Fathers of St. John were guilty of even greater crimes: they conducted a free hospital and a free insane asylum. It is incredible, perhaps, but true, that the religious antipathy of Dieguez and the atheists went so far as to condemn such well-known and efficient nurses as the Fathers of St. John. Nay, more, they defamed them. Their newspapers declared that the Fathers of St. John were holding at their asylum persons whom they pretended to be insane for the purpose of getting possession of their property. Dieguez even sent his private secretary to demand the freedom of an insane man who, he maintained, was unlawfully detained. The secretary was not satisfied until he saw the man, who was a violent maniac. Another time General Hill took out a patient and carried him away with him. But the patient, who was almost an idiot, paid no attention to his supposed liberator and at night said he wanted to go home. He was let go and he went back by himself to the asylum.



"The proscribed priests and sisters spent three terrible days in Manzanillo. Yet the promised ship did not arrive. Nor was there any hope of getting out of that dangerous climate. If they did not leave there,

they would die of starvation, disease or anxiety. They engaged to pay \$6,500 for passage on the ship Hong Kong and Mexico City, where they would have to mix with Chinese and to sleep on miserable bare canvas cots in the hold of the ship. But they preferred this to the savage hospitality of the Constitutionalists. The exiles were able to make up among them only half the price for their passage. It became necessary for the captain to accept their promise to pay him upon their arrival at San Francisco, where American citizens would not fail to give assistance in their misfortune to so many foreigners, whose interests the Government in Washington had promised to protect. Will the American people allow outrages such as these to continue? Will they not demand from Dieguez and the Mexican government an indemnity which will permit us to return to our homes and in the meantime to buy food during our exile?

"We all protest against the unjust spoliation of our property, for which we will demand indemnity when a government shall be established. We protest against the barbarity with which they have expelled us. We protest against the savage manner in which they have driven us out of the country for which we have labored so many years. We protest against the according to us of such treatment as would not be accorded the worst criminals. We protest against the indignity offered our flags and our consulates, against the illegality of the verbal decree by which we were expelled and against the execution of that decree which was even more illegal and cruel. We trust that the American people, who are lovers of justice and civilization, will realize that they are in honor bound to defend us in the name of science and humanity, to demand satisfaction for the flagrant violation of the recommendations which were made by them to Carranza and his followers. If this be not done, then the declaration of the Carranzistas will be confirmed that, whatever they do, is done with the knowledge and approbation of the Washington Government."

III.

NUEVO LEON, ZACATECAS AND SALTILLO.

The Archbishop of Monterey, Monsignor Plancarte, is one of the scholars of Mexico, and one who has devoted his great talents to Mexican historical and ethnological research. For forty years he has been at work, during which time he has published valuable contributions to the history of his native country, notably, "*Tamoanchan el Estado de Morelas y el Principio de la Civilizacion en Mexico.*" A sequel to this work, a study of the third period of Mexico's ancient history, entitled: "*La Invacion Chichimeca en la Valle de Mexico,*" was in preparation and almost finished when the revolutionists reached the city of Monterey in the State of Nueva Leon. The archbishop had collected, during his forty years of work, at the expense of great labor and sacrifice, a magnificent library of books and manuscripts, as well as a museum of Mexican antiquities which he had himself excavated. This latter collection was begun in 1883. When Archbishop Plancarte was at Cuernavaca, where he resided before his promotion to Monterey, the Hon. Elihu Root, and the foreign geologists who attended the Geological Congress of Mexico, came to see this splendid collection. Some of the archbishop's archaeological discoveries were outlined to American scientists by Mr. Holmes, of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, in an article published in a Philadelphia scientific review. The archbishop had scientific correspondence on this subject with the Smithsonian. As Mexico is one of the richest, as well as the most interesting fields for archaeological research, because of its ancient civilization and absorbing story, the work of Archbishop Plancarte was most valuable to scientific men interested in the North American continent. This scientist at least might have escaped the charge of political meddling. His diocese, his studies and his never-ending writings, gave him little thought or interest in anything else.

But such was not the case. When the Carranzistas entered Monterey, it was to commit the same crimes as they had committed in other cities. Homes were entered and taken, the archbishop's being among the first. Then his effects began to disappear. The most valuable books, it is openly said, were taken by Urrieta, a Deputy to Congress, and De la Paz Guerra, Government Secretary of the State of Nuevo Leon, both supposed to be men of honor and character. The labor of forty years was destroyed. The almost completed manuscript of the archbishop's new scientific book went with the rest. No one gained by the destruction

of the manuscripts, for they were thrown away as useless. The museum was looted and its contents taken by people who knew nothing of their value, or who looked upon them as no better than ordinary curios. With these went valuable pictures, family heirlooms, personal belongings, etc. The archbishop was left without the result of his life's labor, and is to-day in exile in San Antonio, with not one single dollar. When I met him he was wearing the borrowed cassock of a simple priest. He had not saved even his pectoral cross.



When the shepherd was stricken, the sheep could expect no protection. Priests were taken publicly to jail; professors were dragged with them. The "liberators," who wanted schools, as they said, had the same respect for the teacher as they had for the preacher. Later on, the foreign priests were freed on the representations of their respective consuls; but they were at once sent out of the country.

Then the Carranzistas turned their attention to the churches. The confessionals were burned and the temples closed. But this was going pretty far, and the people, who however, had no arms, were muttering. So five churches were allowed to open, but only under such restrictions as to do away altogether with liberty of conscience. Nero and Diocletian had their counterparts in Monterey.

Then followed a reign of terror for the other towns of the State of Nueva Leon. All the school property was seized. Even that belonging to individuals was taken. A monument of antiquity, and the finest church in the State, St. Francis of Monterey, dating from the sixteenth century, was destroyed, and its works of art mutilated.

There were no priests killed in Monterey, but the faithful laity were not so fortunate. Señor Mandin was shot without cause or crime. The nuns were spared from the crowning shame, so far as I can learn, but not so the daughters of many respectable and honest families. Zacatecas saw five priests killed horribly; Coahuila lost by shooting the pastor of St. Peter's; Zamora had the awful spectacle of one of her priests found killed in a field and his body half-eaten by animals. But for Monterey there was only robbery, spoliation, imprisonment, exile, the destruction of schools, and the wiping out of scientific records which some would say were worth many lives.

Why did the archbishop leave? He was ordered to go. They accused him of *receiving* a letter from one of Huerta's ministers, begging his influence to bring about peace. So even the reception of such a letter was considered a crime which merited banishment.



As to the facts I have here set down, they are all from a resident of Nuevo Leon who had every opportunity of knowing the truth. He was well acquainted with the archbishop and all the prominent people of the State. He gave the facts to me in an interview and afterward set them down in writing, offering to have the truth of them attested under oath before a notary. Knowing the man's reputation, I replied that this was not necessary. So he added to his statement an expression of his willingness to swear to the truth of his words at any time.



One of the most informing statements in my possession, because it goes very much into detail, was given by an eye-witness to the treatment of the priests of Zacatecas, already touched upon in a general way. Because this statement is written so that the printing of it in full would immediately expose the name of the person who gave it, I rewrite and summarize, using the facts as they were sworn to.

At ten o'clock on the morning of June 25 the staff-officers of General Villa summoned all the priests of Zacatecas to appear at the headquarters. The priests obeyed, and arrived very soon at the house of Dr. De la Torre, where Villa had taken up his residence. Colonel Beytia, chief of Villa's staff, ordered the Vicar-General to send for the priests who had not yet arrived. One of the officers was appointed to accompany the priests appointed by the Vicar-General, the Colonel saying to him: "If this officer does not come back, you will answer with your head."

At noon twenty-three priests were present, and the Colonel made the following statement: "General Villa asks a million pesos from you. If this sum is not turned in by to-morrow morning, all of you will be shot." The priests answered that it was an impossible request, and they prepared themselves to die.

At twelve o'clock that night the Vicar-General and another priest were taken to the guardhouse by Major Villareal, who said: "You are going to be shot, because you will not give the money." The priest said that they had until ten o'clock in the morning, but the Major answered: "I know nothing about that. I know only the orders I have received." The Major gave the Vicar-General permission, however, to return to the other priests, that he might delegate some one to act as Vicar-General after his death. This done, he returned to the guardhouse. Five mounted soldiers took the two priests in charge and brought them to a hill near the railroad station. They were separated at a ditch and money demanded of each one in turn. The priests said again that they possessed nothing. One said that he had his family home and offered to give them that. He said that he had no right to take money which did not belong to him,

meaning whatever diocesan funds he held. The question was then asked: "What kind of a death do you prefer; to be hanged or shot?" The priests selected shooting. The officer in charge then said to one of the soldiers: "Give me your rifle. How many bullets are in it?" The soldier answered: "Two." "Well," said the officer, "I think two are enough." Bitterly, one of the priests said: "I think so, too." "Why," asked the officer of another priest, "do you allow yourself to be shot instead of handing over the money?" The priest answered: "I possess nothing but a few old books. Take them, but let it be known that I am killed on account of my poverty."

The officer then took them back to the guardhouse, where they slept on the bare floor. The same night Major Villareal informed the other priests that the Vicar-General was to be shot unless they raised the money required. The next morning the good people of the city sent food. At eight o'clock the priests were sent out to see if the money could be collected. They came back at four with ten thousand pesos. Villareal ordered them to secure at least twenty thousand, or he would shoot four, beginning with the Superior. The priests were sent out again on June 27, and collected the required sum of twenty thousand pesos, the people giving the money to save the priests. When this money was paid over, Colonel Beytia demanded one hundred thousand pesos. If the money was not forthcoming, eight would be killed. He said that the graves had already been dug on the hills. He gave the priests paper and told them to make their wills. The priests went out again, but could get nothing, for the rich families had gone away. The officer said: "Go out again and beg from door to door." Again the priests went out and begged. It was pitiful, for even the little children gave them their pennies. This was on Friday. On Saturday, Sunday and Monday they were driven out again under guard. On Sunday no devotions were allowed in the churches. On Tuesday, at four in the morning, the priests were awakened by the cries and laments of a girl in the adjoining room occupied by the Colonel. The reason can be guessed. The girl was kept in the house two days. At eight o'clock that morning the priests returned with a hundred thousand pesos that had been given by the people to save them from death. The money was handed over to Major Alvarez and Major Villareal. Thursday morning the priests were still prisoners and Major Alvarez said that four thousand four hundred and fifty pesos of the one hundred thousand were lacking. When the money was paid over, there was nothing lacking. When they counted the money, two thousand and sixty-six pesos were gone. The priests had to go out and beg again. They asked for a receipt and the permission to leave and go about their duties. At eight o'clock that night the priests were ordered

to the railroad station to be given their freedom. They gathered up their little belongings, but Major Villareal ordered them to leave everything behind, as they would be back in a few minutes. Six officers brought them to the station. One showed them a railroad coach and said: "Get in here, because General Villa wants to see you in Torreon." On the night of July 4, on the train, the officers were drunk and insulted the priests in vile language. On the fifth they reached Torreon and were turned over to a guard. In the guardhouse they slept on an earthen floor full of vermin. There were twenty priests, all Mexicans except one. The room in which these twenty were confined was about sixteen feet square. In the middle of the night they were awakened by women who had to pass through the room to reach the officers' quarters in the adjoining room. They received no food from the officers, but the people of Torreon gave them food and clothing. They were kept prisoners until Friday. On that day they were loaded into a railroad coach, where they met four Christian Brothers (teachers). There should have been six, but two had been killed brutally at Zacatecas, together with the Chaplain of the Brothers, Father Vega. This killing was done by General Urbina. On Saturday, the train reached Juarez and the priests were sent across the international bridge into the United States. No charge was made against these priests for violating the laws or helping the cause of Huerta. There was no trial; no hearing of the priests' side of the case. The only possible charge that could have been made was that one of the priests, a canon, went to console the dying soldiers at the hospital, when he saw them lying on the bare floor without medical care and attention. Moved by their deplorable condition, he collected some money from the clergy and gave it to the Governor of Zacatecas to help the wounded. That was all the money they gave to the Federals.



An interesting sidelight on this story comes from the town of Jalpa. After the fall of Zacatecas, several Federal soldiers went to Jalpa. The parish priest remained there. The town occupied an advantageous position between two mountains and was very difficult to approach. Knowing what had occurred at other places, the parish priest told his parishioners that they had a right to defend their lives and property, and the honor of their wives and daughters. The people took up arms and defended themselves. The priest is accused of being a Huertista. Stories will probably be circulated, because of his action, that the priest opposed the government.

It is also interesting to note, since the Constitutionals claim that the rural priests are good and that they are in favor of them, that Father Alba

in the little town of Calera, near Zacatecas, was killed. Reports say that it was by the order of Gen. Eulalio Gutierrez. Is this the Eulalio Gutierrez selected by the Constitutionalist Convention for President of Mexico?

Zacatecas was attacked twice. During the first attack, the Constitutionals took a little village about three miles from the city, Guadalupe. The parish priest was attending eight or ten wounded soldiers in his house. The Constitutionals took the soldiers out and shot them in the yard, and then rode over their dead bodies on horseback, crushing them horribly.



Another statement, sworn to before a notary, is of no less interest, because of the details it gives. While I have the sworn statement itself, I have also had the story verified personally by one of the priests who was tortured. He is a Spanish Benedictine Father, now located at the Benedictine Abbey at Covington, Louisiana. His own story was published in *The Morning Star*, of New Orleans, but this I take from the sworn statements mentioned.

"There were nine Jesuit Fathers in a college at Saltillo, with four scholastics and nine lay Brothers. Three priests were Spanish, one French and the rest Mexicans. The college had a total enrollment of ninety-six students. When Torreon fell the foreign priests were sent away. On the 21st of May, 1914, the Federals withdrew, pillaging the town before leaving, exacting taxes and taking the horses. That same afternoon, at two o'clock, the Constitutionals came in and killed the remaining Federals. The Constitutionals came to the college and took possession on the 21st. Villa came to Saltillo the next day at nine o'clock. The Fathers were summoned to headquarters at three o'clock. Six Jesuit Fathers, three Eudists, a Benedictine, and a number of Diocesan priests were ushered into Villa's presence, who began abusing them and asked how many Spaniards there were among them. The Benedictine Father informed Villa that he was a Spaniard. He then ordered the priests to give him a million pesos in coin. They had no money and three were sent out to beg. Colonel Fierro was sent as a guard. At the college they had three thousand and eighty pesos. They gave Villa that. He was not satisfied. Colonel Fierro was informed that the families who were able to help them were out of town. The priests told him that there was nothing to do but beg from door to door. This, however, he would not permit. Villa said: 'It is necessary to put you to the guillotine and to execute all of the Fathers, and I am the only man to do it.' When Villa was speaking, he kept cracking nuts with his teeth and using vile language. He kept the priests prisoners that night in his house. Some Fathers by this time had collected thirteen thousand pesos. Villa let the secular priests go, but kept the others. That night two priests became ill. One of them got permission to go to the English consulate; the other, who was a Jesuit, was not allowed to go out. Villa himself

said: 'Take away that shameless man from here. Put him in a separate room and shoot him in order to cure him.' The priest was in a high fever that night. The sick priest heard Villa say: 'Take this big goat out and shoot him.' He was carried out on a mattress into another room and left alone. In the afternoon Villa came into the room. 'What is the matter with you?' he asked. 'I am sick with fever,' replied the priest. Villa replied: 'I will send you out to be shot.' All of Sunday night and Monday, the priest was left there sick. At midnight on Monday, he was ordered to get up and follow a soldier. Again he was put with the other priests. In the meantime, at the same hour, Colonel Fierro summoned the other priests, and with a naked sword in his hand ordered them to follow him. As they passed through the hallway, they met several soldiers, who were commanded to load their rifles. The priests were lined up, two by two, and taken to an adjoining house which was empty. They were then shown into a large room, illuminated by candles. An officer told them that they had been sentenced to death, and then turning to the other soldiers, he said: 'Whom shall we begin with?' The priests quietly gave one another absolution, and a Jesuit volunteered to be the first. He was taken away and the others left under guard. After a short time, the priests heard a shot and the noise of a body being dragged out. Colonel Fierro and the soldiers returned. One had a horse-hair rope in his hands. He approached another priest and said: 'Your time has come.' The priest himself put the noose around his neck. He was taken to the large room and commanded to reveal the place where the treasures were hidden. The priest answered that he could do no more. The rope was tightened around his neck, and he was choked until he became unconscious and fell to the floor. He recovered consciousness, however, and one of the soldiers drew a revolver and fired a shot. The same soldier ordered him to stand up, and the priest was again asked for treasures. He answered in the same way and was tortured as before. Again the priest came to his senses and was once more choked into unconsciousness. He was then taken to another room, where he found the other Fathers. Later, two others came in and told them what had happened to them. They heard the groans and chokings later of the sick father."



The sick man had the same experiences as the others. They were taken back to Villa's house, and on the way the soldiers who had maltreated them asked forgiveness, saying that they had to obey superior orders.

"Colonel Fierro, with an escort of soldiers, took the priests to the railroad station. The people had gathered around to show sympathy, but the Colonel shouted: 'Those who show any sympathy for these men must go with them.' They were placed in a freight car under guard. One of the officers was drunk. When the train was about to leave Saltillo, a girl fifteen years of age came with blankets for the priests. Villa ordered this girl to be thrown into the car with them, so as to make people think that she was one of their party, but she broke away and escaped. During the journey the drunken Colonel kept threatening to

kill the priests. Once he pointed his revolver at the Superior of the Eudists, but a soldier knocked up his arm and the shot went wild. At Paredon, a prostitute was put into the car. They came to a place where the track was torn up, and horses had to be had for six miles. When asking for the horses, it was announced to the people that ten horses were needed for the priests and one for the prostitute, who was their traveling companion. When they reached the railroad again, they were put into a cattle car without food. During the night the prostitute remained with the officer in charge. At Torreon the priests were kept prisoners. At the barracks they were given food. In the morning they were sent to Chihuahua under the guard of Beytia, General Villa's chief of staff, who was drunk and kept threatening death to a sick priest and to an old one. They had no food all day. They passed the night at Chihuahua on the bare floors. On Sunday they were given a meal and on Sunday night taken to the station again. The following morning they were sent to Juarez and expelled from the Mexican territory. There was no medical attention given them until they arrived at El Paso, where Dr. Paul Gallagher and Dr. Carpenter treated their throats. They had never contributed one dollar to Huerta. No crime was charged against them."

IV.

THE PERSECUTION OF THE SISTERS.

Sincerely do I wish that this chapter could be left out of my record. I never approached a task with more reluctance of soul than the one which faces me now. It is abhorrent to even think that men could be so low and bestial as to touch, with unholy hands, the pure women who have dedicated their lives to God and to God's poor; and who have consecrated their white souls to the virginity made forever blessed by the Virgin Mother of our Redeemer. But the story must be told, and, since it must, let a Sister from Mexico who saw with her own eyes the consequences of the unbridled lust let loose by the revolutionists, tell it in her own way. Her statement was sworn to in the most solemn manner before an American archbishop, and in my presence. Signatures are attested by an ecclesiastical notary under the official seal of the diocese. I use nearly all of the document. What follows is translated from the original Spanish:

"The sad and lamentable situation of our Mexican Republic compels me to state under oath the conditions which exist in Mexico as a result of the diabolical persecution of the Catholic Church.

"Our temples are closed and our churches profaned. On our altars the Holy Sacrifice is no longer offered. Our confessionals have been burned in the public squares and there is hardly one that dares to approach the Sacrament of Penance, even in the most remote corner of a home. The Immaculate Lamb no longer comes to aid our souls, and the priest who dares offer the Holy Sacrifice is sentenced to death. Homes are desolated, mothers cry over the death of their sons, husbands are torn from their families for service with the troops, while their children weep at bidding their father the last farewell. Our priests are persecuted. They wander along the road without anything to eat. Prelates have been forced to abandon us and it seems that God Himself has hidden. Church bells no longer ring. The blood of our brothers runs in the streets. Nuns are taken to the barracks and their virginity attacked.

"It appears as if hell had unchained itself and devils had taken possession of men to harm their brothers. Anarchy and revenge have seized their hearts, and the rich are left in the worst misery.

"Since Don Francisco Madero, in 1910, declared war against Don Porfirio Diaz to this date, we have not had a moment of peace, and following Madero's example, many others have arisen in arms to attack the Catholic Church on all sides — some worse than others — so that there is not one single State in the Republic that has not been a victim of horrible outrages.

"The revolutionists have closed the temples and prohibited the Sacraments to the degree that any priest daring to hear confession or offer the Holy Sacrifice is shot. Confessionals and some of the statues of the Saints have been burned in the public squares, accompanied by music and improper speeches. The churches have been so profaned that some of the revolutionists have entered them on horseback. Statues were demolished and relics trampled on. Over the floor the Holy Hosts have been scattered, and in some instances have been fed to the horses.

"In some churches the Carranzistas have impersonated priests, saying Mass, and have occupied the confessionals, hearing confessions and disclosing what has been told to them. (All of this I have seen with my own eyes.)

"The most beautiful of the temples in the Republic, the Church of San Antonio, at Aguascalientes, has been converted into the Legislative Hall. The Church of San Jose, in Queretaro, is now the public library. The wonderful convent of the Discalced Carmelites, also in Queretaro, has been seized, and the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, who owned a handsome Lyceum, the approximate total value of which was over \$500,000, lost more than \$50,000 spent in repairing it. The colleges of the Lazarist Fathers, Jesuits, and many others have perished. The property of the Church has been appropriated and many of the ecclesiastical archives have been burned. The orders of nuns have been expelled from the Republic, giving them only a half hour's time to leave, and without allowing them to take the least piece of wearing apparel. Many religious have been taken to the barracks and the prison, where their chastity has been in grave danger. From the Catholic schools the furniture has been stolen. Immorality has extended to such a degree that not only virginity has been violated, but nuns have been taken away by force and are being subjected to the most horrible suffering.

"In Mexico City I have seen with the utmost regret many religious who have been victims of the unbridled passions of the soldiers. Many I found bemoaning their misfortune, being about to become mothers, some in their own homes and others in maternity hospitals. Others have allowed themselves to be carried away by their misfortune and have given up all, filled with desperation and shame. They complain against God, saying that they have been abandoned by Him.

"Religious of various orders have so dressed themselves, and so go about, as to hide the fact that they are nuns, for fear that the revolutionists may carry them away. Some priests worthy of full credit, have told me that, in a hospital located in ———, there are fifty religious that were taken away by the soldiers, out of which forty-five are about to become mothers, notwithstanding the fact that they have religious vocations and were bound by vows.

"In the ———, in Mexico City, are others in this same condition and others also in the hospital of ———. In Celaya and Mexico City I have seen many others that were obliged to join the Red Cross, and under this pretext were held as slaves, treated by the soldiers as though they were their own women and not giving any attention to the sick. In a great many cases young women, after having been compelled to lead this life, were thrown out into the street, some being killed as though they were animals.

"As to the clergy! What have the ministers of God not suffered? Fathers —— and —— (at present in the United States) can tell. They were under sentence of death only because they directed Catholic labor societies. Many have been shot, and those having any property have been exiled and their property seized. In Guadalajara the clergy in its entirety was exiled, having been compelled to leave in box and cattle cars, their departure being accompanied by a band playing burlesque music amidst mockery and hooting. Eight days later the religious were compelled to leave and, thank God, women were brave enough to arm themselves with stones to use if music was played upon their leaving.

"The clergy in Torreon and Zacatecas were offered for ransom, and after obtaining \$100,000, were compelled to pave the streets. Many were forced to enlist with the army, while others were shot. Lastly, they were exiled without being allowed to take any clothing or money.

"The clergy in Queretaro were imprisoned and exceedingly heavy fines imposed upon them and were later exiled.

"Many Fathers have been in the penitentiary in Mexico City, while others are at present used as servants. When they are discharged they must go without clothing—many of them being obliged to dress as women in order to leave. In some towns they have been locked up together with bad women and threatened with death if they resisted.

"I have seen used as saddle blankets and ornaments on the horses, the chasubles, stoles, maniples, girdles, pluvial capes and altar linen; while women wore the copes, and the corporals were used as handkerchiefs. The holy vases have been profaned in sundry ways. After drinking from them, the soldiers used them as night vessels, which they afterwards threw into the street. In some towns the chalice has been burned and the Hosts scattered on the floor. Soldiers have sacrilegiously eaten them and, as before said, they have also been fed to the horses. Statues were used as targets until they fell to the floor. I have seen wagonloads of statues that were on their way to be burned; some I was fortunate enough to save, by daring to address the chief, telling him that I would rather be burned before the statue of my Holy Mother. The best sculptures have been taken away to the museums. The Del Carmen Church, in Queretaro, was to have been transformed into a dance hall, but I do not know whether the intended work has been completed. In other churches the images of Christ have also been shot at.

"On the road from —— to Mexico City I found seven religious who asked to be directed to a maternity hospital, claiming not to be religious, but the fact that they were religious was very evident from their manner of speaking. They related to me how they were able to escape from the mountains where the revolutionists had held them. I tried to console them, but it was useless. They said that they were already condemned and abandoned by God, and were in such a despairing condition that they cursed the hour of their profession.

"All these horrible things have compelled me to come to —— as a refugee, bringing with me seven religious, of whom I was Prioress, in order to bring them to safety and away from the personal persecution that some were subjected to. It is a fact that they were being searched for by means of photographs, and when found would have been taken away and killed if they resisted.

"Our community, the ———, was located in the city of ———, where I left on July 9 for ———, in the hopes of making a new home, bringing with me ten postulants and other religious, to get away from the danger which threatened them in ———. I left there other religious awaiting the results of my new foundation in ———, who were to join me later. Only with great difficulty was I able to keep them together and alive, as their families had lost all their property; consequently their dowries were gone and I had not even a single cent. On the 27th of July all the Orders were expelled from ———, including ourselves, and we were given twenty-four hours' time to leave the country.

"Not having any means, I presented myself to the local military chief, ———, begging him to intercede in our favor with Governor ———, so that we might be allowed two or three months to look for funds with which to leave the country. This gentleman told me that he was a Catholic, and advised me to leave the Republic as soon as possible if we did not want to suffer the same outrages that many others went through in other places. He offered me all kinds of guarantees and told me how to save my nuns from the many dangers that threatened them.

"To this gentleman I also came after having scaled the walls of the Church of ——— in order to save four sculptures and other altar ornaments. In this case I was incurring a fault which was subject to the death penalty as punishment. Not only was I forgiven for this, but he gave me a safe conduct to avoid being molested by any one. I take the liberty of recommending him as a good man. I am very grateful to him.

"On the 28th of August, I returned to ——— to bring the other religious that remained there, in order that we might leave the Republic together. Our religious were badly persecuted in ——— and had to be divided and placed in private homes to avoid their being taken to the barracks.

"I returned to ——— with my nuns, and on the road I met several spies who injured us greatly. In a rented house we only had three rooms for twenty-four religious and novices, and each day I had to go out in search for bread to eat. They were deprived of hearing Mass and receiving Communion. God only knows what I suffered to liberate them from danger and obtain food.

"For twenty-two days I was scarcely able to sleep, fearing that at any moment the house would be attacked and the nuns stolen. They were obliged to sleep on the floor of one room after offering to God the sacrifices of the day.

"Some days I was obliged to change houses as often as three times, since our hiding-places had been discovered, which fact the officer (my friend) would tell me. The spies denounced us again. I was compelled to leave with seven for the ———, and beg of foreign prelates that they permit me to make a new home, where I could safely place the other religious that I had under my charge, and who are at present hiding in the city of ———, Mexico.

"I leave to God the fulfillment of His holy will and, in the meantime, pray Him to remedy the troubles of the Mexican Republic and preserve the President of the United States of America, so that he may stop the numerous calamities that have fallen upon the Mexican Church."

Names of persons and places which might identify the Sister Superior who wrote the above statement, or her friends, have been eliminated for reasons already given; but, in this case especially, because some of the Sisters have not yet escaped, and the devoted Superior, supplied with the necessary money by The Catholic Church Extension Society, has returned to Mexico to find them and bring them to a place of safety.

No further comment on this sworn statement is necessary.

If any doubt remains as to the certainty of these abominable outrages, the following, which is a sworn statement before a notary, by one of the most prominent parish priests of Mexico City, ought to put it to rest: "The stories regarding outrages against Sisters are so common in the City of Mexico that they are believed by all. I have never heard a denial even by those whose interest it would be to disprove them. The common information is to the effect that many Sisters are pregnant, and others suffering from loathsome diseases, because of assaults upon them by revolutionary soldiers."

Another sworn statement, for the publication of which full permission was given by the person making it, testifies to the same effect. The part of the statement which concerns the outrages is as follows:

"I have it on the authority of Dr. ——— (no permission to publish this name, as the doctor is still in Mexico), physician in the street called ——— in ———, Mexico, that in his own private house there were seventeen Sisters who had been outraged by revolutionists, and were in a pregnant condition. I also know that other Sisters in the same condition were in the ——— Asylum of Mexico City."

(Signed) N. CORONA.

"State of Texas, }
"County of Galveston. }

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this 24th day of October, 1914.

(Signed) H. REBAUD,

[SEAL]

Notary Public for Galveston County, Texas.



On the same day the following sworn statement was given me:

"I know that one month ago, to my certain knowledge, Sisters outraged by revolutionists and in a pregnant condition were in the ——— Asylum of Mexico City. This house is in charge of Miss ———, (Street ———) ———. The stories of the outrages on Sisters are so commonly spoken of in Mexico City as to vanquish all thought of their not having occurred. Naturally, the names of the Sisters, and the houses they are in, were kept as secret as possible, in view of the future of the poor, unfortunate victims themselves.

.....

Superior of ——— Church.

"State of Texas, }
"County of Galveston. }

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of October, 1914.

(Signed) H. REBAUD,

[SEAL]

Notary Public for Galveston County, Texas.



The next statement is signed by the Superior-General of one of the large teaching orders of Mexico. The good reputation and high character of the Superior-General is attested by two archbishops, who in witness thereto have signed the original document, which is in my possession:

“Having been requested to inform you of my knowledge regarding the outrages suffered by the religious in Mexico at the hands of the revolutionists, I can truthfully give the following information:

“While the Mother Superior of ——— of ——— Sisters of ———, was in Mexico during the month of June last, and having heard that there had arrived a number of religious that had been outraged, filled with indignation and pain, she asked permission of the Mother-General to investigate the whereabouts of these religious, in the hope of offering them refuge and taking care of them, if it were possible. Her first efforts were directed to the ——— Hospital, where it was stated these religious would be found. Upon calling there, she was informed of the *veracity of these charges*, but was advised that the nuns had already been transferred to the religious' house of ———. Finding that they were already being taken care of, she made no further inquiries in this direction, in view of the fact that it was very painful and mortifying to all.’



The following is an extract from a letter dated, “Mexico City, October 25, 1914.” Original is in the hands of a gentleman in San Antonio, Texas:

“Concerning the subject you speak of in your letter (the outrages), I can tell you that, only three months ago, a lady asked me to receive in my sanitarium three nuns from Durango who were in the said condition.”



Here is a translation from the columns of *El Presente*, a Mexican paper published in the Spanish language at San Antonio, Texas. The date of the issue from which the article is taken is November 7, 1914.

“But let us not mislead ourselves. We said that the revolution completely ignored the manly virtue of respect towards women, and the irrefutable evidence is at hand. Even if some of our readers who are not accustomed to read in print of certain criminal deeds, it is necessary to state that the Constitutionalist horde not only devoted themselves to stealing, murdering and incendiarism, but, worst of all, are the violators of unfortunate women and are guilty of all kinds of wrongs and indignities. In every city, in every town, and in every country place, they have left the ravages of their visit. While we could specifically give

names, places and dates, we will not do so for fear of being considered chroniclers of dishonor and lost virginity.

"Yet there is still more. The Mexican revolutionists have committed the greatest crime that could be committed, the one that can hardly be conceived by any civilized people of the present day. We refer to the infamous and monstrous outrages upon the nuns in Mexico."



The refinement of deviltry could scarcely surpass what the following from signed statement of a Vicar-General, the original of which is in my possession, narrates :

"A priest of the same diocese (——) was locked in a room with a woman of evil repute. Then they (the revolutionists) calumniated him, and gave him a mock trial before a "Council of War," and sentenced him to be burned to death. They did not carry this sentence out, but the priest became mad. He lost his reason for three days. Then they brought him to —— and let him go free."

Why did they not finish their work? A ruined reputation is not preferable to a martyr's crown.



This letter comes from Toluca. I have the original, which was written by the daughter of a respectable family of that city, a lady who had devoted herself to charitable works. It was addressed to her pastor, who was then and still is in exile in the United States :

"I am going to ask you a question. If one should fall into the hands of —— (revolutionists), would it not be preferable to end one's life than to suffer their usual outrages? I did not think that this would ever come, and therefore never made this inquiry before, but the situation seems very probable now. Had we not full confidence in our good God, I believe we would perish. What we expected did not happen, but what we never imagined took place. There is a feeling of pain, fear, indignation and shame in the face of so many horrible things."

Should she commit suicide rather than suffer what others suffered? God of Heaven! and this is the twentieth century of the Christian dispensation, but Christians remain unmoved.



To these I add a sworn statement, already published in *America*, addressed to the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, Secretary of State, and which is, therefore, to be found in the archives of the State Department at Washington :

(COPY)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 8, 1914.

To His Excellency, The Hon. W. J. Bryan, Secretary of State:

SIR,— On July 22 last I had the honor of addressing your Excellency

on the subject of the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico as practiced by the revolutionary parties now in power in that country.

The Third Assistant Secretary of State, under date of July 24, acknowledged receipt of my letter.

Since then I have made the acquaintance of the Rev. R. H. Tierney, editor of the Catholic paper *America*, published in New York City, who writes me that he visited you concerning this subject, and that your Excellency wished to hear me on the same matter. I have thought it well, therefore, to note down for your convenience the principal points, and I wish to say that I have written down nothing of which I am not fully aware and can vouch for personally. I have lived in Mexico twenty-three years, am a German by birth, by religion a Lutheran, and am sixty years of age.

I know of Catholic clergymen, who under pain of death were forced to sweep the streets of a city and do menial work for common, illiterate soldiers.

Of a bishop, seventy years old, deported to the penal colony on the Pacific Coast.

Of several priests in the Monterey penitentiary as late as August 30, last.

Of a parish priest, eighty years old, so tortured that he lost his reason.

Of many deported to Texas, both Mexicans and foreigners.

Of priests and sisters tortured by hanging and strangling.

Of a priest in hiding who was enticed out to confess a person and instead was thrown into a dungeon.

Of forty Sisters of Charity who have been violated, of which number four are known to me, and one of these has become demented.

I have been instrumental in saving six Sisters and seven girl pupils from the same fate.

Of an Englishman who tried to save the personal effects of these thirteen women, being fined \$2,000 for the attempt.

Of all the confessionals of the Monterey district churches being piled in a public square and burned.

Of valuable paintings stolen from churches and supposedly brought to the United States by filibusters.

Of Constitutionalist soldiers, led by a man who is now Governor of a State in Mexico, doing on the altar what decency does not permit me to say.

Of doing the same at another church, into the chalice, and making the priest drink of it.

Of decrees published by those now Governors of States, prohibiting the practice of religion, and closing the churches, convents and schools.

I am respectfully your humble servant,

(Signed) MARTIN STECKER.

117 B Street S. E.

District of Columbia:

Martin Stecker, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that the foregoing is a true copy of a letter sent by him to the Hon. Wm. J. Bryan, and that the same is in all substantial particulars a true statement of facts.

MARTIN STECKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of October, 1914.

CHARLES M. BIRCKHEAD,
Notary Public, D. C.

Decency refuses permission to chronicle more. Even as these statements stand I have hesitated about printing all of them, but if the story is to be told it must be told as it is. Whatever good is to come out of it for the poor refugees, and the almost destroyed church in Mexico, will come only when a fair-minded and just people have the truth.

How do *you* like it? Put your own religious teachers and pastors in the same place and judge.

V.

YUCATAN.

The case of Yucatan is one of the saddest in the history of the Mexican persecutions. Not because the people and the Church were treated more severely than in other places, but because Yucatan had not been in rebellion at all, and had kept the peace. The citizens of the State simply accepted conditions as they were. The people of Yucatan are a very quiet and industrious people. They ask for nothing better than such quiet and industry. Stories published some years ago by an American magazine concerning "barbarities" in Yucatan were bitterly resented by the people. No section of Mexico has had more prosperity, considering everything, than the State of Yucatan. The fact that the people did not take up arms is perhaps one of the most eloquent testimonies that could be given as to the satisfactory condition of the State.

The great industry of Yucatan is the growing of hemp. The country could, if the people so desired, grow a great many other things, but the hemp industry is very profitable. Most of it is sold in the United States or through American merchants. The port of the state is called Progreso. It is the Mexican terminus of the Ward Line steamers from New York. The city of Merida, the capital, as well as the state, is rich in antiquities connected with the history of Mexico. Excavations have been made which have resulted in rich archaeological treasures. One of the greatest archaeologists was the former Archbishop of Merida, a native Mexican, by birth of Indian blood. He was one of Mexico's most learned men and did in the South what Archbishop Plancarte was doing in the North. He had published valuable works which attracted the attention of scientists everywhere. The present Archbishop of Yucatan is a native Mexican of German descent, a man of very great ability and a wise administrator. He has made a decided mark on the Church in his diocese, and is loved and revered by his people.



Although Yucatan was, as I already said, peaceful and industrious, and although it was taken over by the revolutionists without fighting, nevertheless the first effort made was to bleed the people. As soon as the Constitutionalist Governor Avila took command, a "loan" of \$8,000,000 was imposed upon the hemp growers. The decree calling for this robbery was printed in *La Revista de Yucatan* on September 29, 1914. The decree

gives, as a reason for the impost, that the northern section of Mexico suffered great dangers; that its fields were made barren and its cattle destroyed, so as to make it impossible to contribute in a financial way "to the complete reestablishment of order." The decree goes on to say that "the State of Yucatan has been the only one not suffering the consequences of a civil war, and able to preserve all its fountains of wealth, which are in full production." The impost of \$8,000,000 was made on all the inhabitants of the State who have a capital of \$100,000 or more. The "loan" was compulsory and individuals subject to it were obliged to pay *within five days*.

Before issuing this decree, and also before the expulsion of the clergy and the closing of the churches, the Constitutionals took good care to disarm the people. Not a gun was left in Yucatan. Resistance was impossible. This was only following the plans already put into force in other states. The Constitutionals imposed their will in the name of the people, whether the people wanted it or not. Robbery under these circumstances is easy. One can not object too strenuously when the robber has a gun and the victim is weaponless.

The condition of the hemp growers was, however, not so favorable as the decree intimated. It was not easy for them to raise \$8,000,000 in five days, with the consequences of war in other states and in Europe upon the country. They complained very bitterly, mentioning their business debts. If they could not pay these, they would be ruined. The paying of the Constitutionalist impost meant paralyzing the industries of Yucatan.



But there is a side light also to be thrown upon the difficulty — currency. While Yucatan had more coin than perhaps any other section of Mexico, yet the coin had constantly been withdrawn from circulation. The people were hoarding it, because they knew very well that every effort was being made by the revolutionists to get all the coin of the country into their hands. Instead of coin the revolutionists had issued paper money. The paper money of Carranza and Villa was practically worthless, and even the paper issued by the Mexican banks was, while I was in Texas, valued only at about 16 cents on the dollar. Americans bought it at 16 cents to pay their bills in Mexico where it had to be taken at face value. Mexican producers were, therefore, being paid at the rate of 16 cents on the dollar for what they were exporting. To make matters worse, the Constitutionals issued a decree obliging all people having coin or bank notes, to put them in circulation, or be punished severely. It will be remembered that more than one Mexican "patriot" decamped with considerable money. He always took his money

out in coin or transferred it to Europe. There is a good reason why the present "patriots" should force the Mexican people to put their coin in circulation and accept paper instead. The effect on the currency and on business of such a move can easily be imagined. The position of the planters of Yucatan was an unenviable one.

However, the Governor was willing to relieve the situation as far as he could, but not to the extent of giving up the "loan." *He relieved it by declaring that for six months the planters should not be obliged to pay any other debts.* He intended putting on another "loan" of from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 and hitting the smaller planters with it; so it was declared in another decree that no one in Yucatan should be obliged to pay his business debts for a period of six months. There was then no excuse for the planters. The Constitutionalist government was their only debtor — for six months; but after that time they would have to pay the other debts in the face of hard times and a debased currency. There was no recourse, for the guns were aimed at them. One planter's share was \$400,000. A little more "liberty" of this kind in Yucatan and the industries of the state would be no more.

Then the Constitutionlists tackled the Church, but it was necessary now to take a further measure of precaution, so the Governor issued Decree No. 18, which "under authority vested in him by the First Chief of the Constitutionalist Army," considered: "that the government should aim to purify all social elements, in order to prepare for a vigorous revival of constitutional government — considering, secondly, that as the national press is amongst these elements it must have immediate attention, as up to the present time, editors have in their profession lacked the necessary social guarantee." (What this means, of course, was known only to the government. Editors have never been considered *social* beings by their contributors; and the Governor of Yucatan had become quite a contributor to the press, with decrees at least.) So the Governor ordered that on the very next day all newspapers in the state should cease publication. And further, "that before resuming publication they would have to apply to the Governor for a permit, setting forth qualifications and proofs of honesty, morality and capacity to direct such a publication." The Governor offered to give such permits "to those who in his opinion possessed the necessary qualifications."

The editors had to have their honesty passed upon by the greatest set of thieves that ever operated in the Republic of Mexico; their morality passed upon by the representatives of the most bestial soldiery that ever inflicted themselves upon a peaceful populace. The liberty of the press went out by the scratch of a governor's pen. Yet this is the government in which we Americans place our hopes for peace in Mexico.

Only last week I read a laudatory editorial on Carranza in one of the most prominent American dailies. I wonder how the writer of the editorial would enjoy having his hero pass upon his honesty and morality.



All means of defense gone, and the press muzzled, then came the destruction of the Church. Archbishop and priests were exiled. The foreign priests, of course, went first. All residing in the State of Yucatan for less than thirty years had to go within five days' time. Sixty-five arrived in Cuba penniless. If they did not go peacefully, violence was threatened. They had already resorted to violence in Campeche. So the clergy were expelled as "pernicious foreigners," but not without protest. The ladies of Yucatan took up their cause and forwarded the following to the governor:

"To the Honorable Governor:

"We have come to intercede on behalf of those who have lived on the Yucatan soil, loving it as their own, dividing the sorrows and happiness of our land with us, with no other end than to propagate the doctrine of love, peace and mercy; with no other idea than to give consolation to the fallen, courage to the harassed and hope to the despairing; with no other arms of defense than the image of Him who ordered us to love one another as brothers; with no other politics than planting seeds of goodness, charity and the fulfilment of our duty; and with no other defense or shelter than faith in our laws and the guarantees of the Yucatan land as a mother to all living on her soil. Those men to-day, against whom no shade of wrong can be found in Yucatan or anywhere else, in whose lives society has never found the least flaw, are cruelly expelled from this land without any wrong-doing, but solely for political reasons to which they are entirely foreign. Our spirit can not conciliate this with the points of liberty and democracy stated in the Constitution. Those for whom we ask justice have had no part in the battles that have stained with blood our country and filled our homes with sorrow and pain. Here in Yucatan we do not and can not understand the danger that would compel the exiling of the priests, as from these priests that are to-day exiled we have only received lessons of piety, beneficial deeds and a public education. We desire for our children, for our brothers, and for all the sons of this Yucatan soil who want to keep their beliefs and their ideals as their richest social inheritance, the Christian education which is the most becoming for the safeguarding of dignity and nobility of life. You, Señor Governor, no doubt retain amongst your most pleasing remembrances those of your school days, and from which you have unquestionably found much consolation more than once. Therefore, Sir, we dare invoke the sweet, maternal love that, even after death, lives in your mind as a benediction from the regions of eternity, and are, therefore, sending to you our manifestation of pain and respectful supplication against the expulsion of foreign priests. We ask in the name of all Yucatan, in the name of all that live and love our land, and in the name of the blessed woman to whom you gave the sweet title of 'mother,'

and who from Heaven joins us in our request, that you do not consent to close the Yucatan soil to those priests, and that they may not receive as compensation for their labors for good and peace, the bitterness of exile. We ask that you do this for our people in the same spirit as if you were placing the case before your own father, and as if you wanted to deed a title of just pride to your son."

"Requested in Merida on the 5th of the month of October, 1914."

The above document will be interesting to those who assert that these expulsions of clergymen were desired by the people. It is at once a testimony to the priests themselves, to the religious character of the people of Yucatan and to the efficiency of the Church in that State.

The appeal to the "liberties" guaranteed under the Constitution is certainly appropriate, when made to a Constitutionalist Governor; but not timely, for Villareal said: "We want to get along awhile without our Constitution."



I have set down this story of Yucatan, not as a solitary example of overriding the laws and the Constitution of Mexico, but simply as an example of the *peaceful* actions of the Constitutionalist. It is true that the Governor of Yucatan did not murder any priests, nor did his soldiers outrage any Sisters, but he murdered the free press and outraged the laws. Yet we Americans expect that from such actions will come peace, tranquillity, and the revival of industry to the Republic of Mexico.

VI.

THE CAMPAIGN OF CALUMNY.

General Antonio I. Villareal was the president of the Constitutionalist convention at Aguascalientes. This convention was called for the purpose of bringing peace to Mexico. Its keynote was supposed to be *conciliation*. It began with a declaration of war against the Church, and ended with a declaration of war against the chief of the Revolution. It has plunged Mexico once more into a bath of blood. Villa is in arms against Carranza. They are flinging charges at one another; and, incidentally, proving from their own mouths the charges that I make in this book. In the manifesto of General Villa against his rival, an original copy of which is in my possession, he charges his superior with having "interfered with liberty of conscience by the persecution of the Church; of having permitted governors to suppress religion, of imposing penalties on religious practices authorized by law, of outraging profoundly the religious feelings of the people through acts condemned by civilization and the rights of nations."



Carranza's answer is interesting. He says:

"If General Villa were capable of weighing the meaning of what they wrote for him to sign, he would not have put himself in such an unseemly situation by formulating the charges against me, because it was he himself who exaggerated this just resentment of the Constitutionalist party against the members of the Catholic clergy for sustaining the dictatorship. He went so far as to cause real alarm or indignation among all classes of society.

"The fact is that General Villa, who now seeks an agreement with the clergy by showing himself so respectful toward religion and religious practices, did, in every place he occupied during the campaign, expel the priests, close the churches, and forbid religious exercises. And in Zacatecas his anti-religious fanaticism reached a climax which contrasts greatly with his present Christian meekness. He expelled eleven priests of different nationalities, of whom three were French, and of these no one yet knows their resting-place.

"It is high time to recall to General Villa in this regard the hearty congratulation which he sent to General Antonio I. Villareal, Governor of Nueva Leon, when the latter published a decree in which he restricted

religious exercises and forbade Confession. The following is the text of the congratulatory message:

“CHIHUAHUA, July 29.

“General Antonio I. Villareal,—I congratulate you heartily and enthusiastically on your decree imposing restrictions on the clergy in the State over which you worthily rule. And already I am hastening to follow your wise example, because, like yourself, I think that one of the greatest enemies of our progress and liberties has been the corrupt clergy who have so long ruled in our country. I salute you affectionately.

“GENERAL-IN-CHIEF FRANCISCO VILLA.”



This effort on the part of General Carranza to shift the blame for outrages against liberty of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution weakens when it is understood that at no time before the rupture of the relations of the two leaders was General Villa anything but a subordinate of General Carranza. The latter claimed the title and rights of “First Chief,” quarreled with the Aguascalientes Convention for daring to suggest that it was more powerful than he, and quarreled with Villa himself when he gave his allegiance to that body. On the other hand, after the Battle of Torreon, when Villa was certainly at the height of his power and all looked for him to proclaim his attitude and take the leadership, he gave out a statement, which was published in all the American and Mexican papers, acknowledging his position of inferiority to that of Carranza, hailing him as his Chief, and proclaiming his loyalty to him. This declaration Carranza accepted.

All this makes very plain the fact that General Carranza was the man who directed the policy of the Revolutionists; who was behind him makes little difference. It is certain that General Villa was not. He was acting under the orders, or according to the known policy of the First Chief. The responsibility rests with General Carranza.

It is not without significance that the moment General Villa broke with his Chief, his policy toward religion changed; and it was he who launched the charges of persecution and invasion of the rights of conscience against his former superior. Villa's name, it is true, appears in the accounts of the torturing of priests, but Villa's own actions were few. His officers, especially Colonel Fierro, seemed to take the actual work out of his hands. Much was done in Villa's name of which he probably knew very little. His account was bad enough. How much did certain officers add to it without his authority or with the certainty that he could not interfere? Villa's later actions do not agree with his former ones; while Carranza began as a persecutor at Durango and persecutes still in the State of Vera Cruz.



This same Antonio I. Villareal, to whom General Carranza referred above, is, I believe, the man upon whom the chief responsibility for the persecutions rests. It was he who opened the convention of Aguascalientes with an attack upon the Church, from which I take the following :

"One of our main objects should be to annihilate our enemy, so that he may be absolutely dead. . . . *Our Constitution prohibits confiscation; therefore we want to live a little time without our Constitution.*

. . . We must tear from the enemy the foundations upon which a new revolution may be builded. We must tear from him his properties. We must make him impotent, as an enemy without gold is an enemy at whom we may laugh. Our enemy is privilege, the privilege maintained from the pulpit through the services of the entire Christian clergy. . . . We must tear away the wealth of the powerful and must also comply with the Laws of Reform, which refer to the wealth of the clergy. In the same manner that the Laws of Reform nationalize the property of the clergy, we must nationalize the property of privilege for the welfare of this Republic. It has been done. . . . From the clergy we must tear the property which they acquired under the conciliatory policy of General Diaz. They have a right to use the temples consecrated to religion, but no right to own, as they do, convents and beautiful buildings, all of which the priests call 'educational property,' but are nothing else than foundations of perversion for children's minds.

"The Revolution should not attempt anything against liberty of conscience or liberty of worship. During the period of activity it was just and *it has been done*. It was in order to punish the clergy that associated with Huerta and the Catholics that furnished him money; but past that period, we should, like good Liberals, respect all worship, but never allow our children to be poisoned. It is better to prohibit the teachings of the clergy than religion. Let them continue to preach, but prohibit their teaching-rights."



From this speech, which was received with great applause by the convention, some things stand out very strongly. First, that the Constitutionalists do not want the Constitution until they have finished robbing, raping and murdering. No one can read anything else out of the discourse. Second, after they have taken all they can get, and have committed all the atrocities in the calendar of crimes, then they want to sit down for a period of merited rest, with the money they have gathered, and ask the Republic to give them and their ill-gotten gains the protection of the law. Third, they desire to take away from the Church everything but the use of the church buildings; that is, such of them as have not, at that time, been turned to other uses. This, of course, means

liberty of conscience and worship; *but the clergy must not do any more than pray in the churches. They will not be permitted to teach, to administer the Sacraments, to attend the dying, or, in fact, carry out their ministry in any way except by prayer.*

How would the Protestants of the United States like to be in this condition? Supposing the shoe were on the other foot, would it pinch? And yet a great many of our Protestant fellow-citizens hope for great things in Mexico from the Constitutionalist régime.



It is interesting to ask how the clergy are supposed to live under these circumstances. According to Constitutionalist decrees, copies of which I have, they are forbidden to ask offerings or tithes. Now, all offerings and tithes for the support of religion in Mexico have been free-will offerings. No one has been taxed for the Church. No one has been forced to pay anything. In some sections of the Republic the old tithe custom has been kept up by the people themselves; in other sections religion is supported only through offerings at baptism, marriages and funerals; but these, too, are forbidden, and forbidden under severest penalties. So liberty of worship in Mexico is to consist of this: The clergy can not teach, therefore can not train candidates for the priesthood in seminaries. That disposes of the question of having priests; there can be none. It might be said that the deficiency can be made up from other countries; but a foreign clergy is prohibited in Mexico, and all the foreign clergy have already been expelled. The clergy has the full right and permission to pray, when it is provided that there will be no clergy at all to offer the prayers. Again, those priests who remain may not take up collections, may not receive offerings when people are accustomed to make them, may not live by their labor of love at all. In fear lest some of them could make a living otherwise, the law is to be enforced that they may not have investments, and may not even leave their family legacies to the upkeep of religion. This is "liberty of conscience." This is "freedom of worship." This is "democratic government." With this program the Constitutionalist come before the American people to ask for sympathy and assistance; and have had it.



How would this affect the Protestant missionaries in Mexico? They want it because they desire the destruction of the Catholic Church. Are they going to live within the law, or stand up against the law? They will, of course, live within the law; but if foreign priests are not allowed, foreign ministers can not be allowed either. If they are, the law is violated. If they violate the law and live in Mexico, how about their

teaching? How about the many existing Protestant schools and colleges? Will an exception be made in favor of these? If so, Protestants will be demanding the special privileges against which General Villareal shouts. If Protestants build churches, will not these also be confiscated? But, above all, what of the future? The aim of all Protestant missionary activity is to found Protestantism permanently. Missions call for beginnings only. The day is looked forward to when the output from the missionary treasury will cease, and the converts support their own church. The missions are then said to be on a "self-supporting basis." Donors to missions in the United States are encouraged with the hope that many of their missions will soon be in that condition. Very well; how soon will the Mexican Protestant missions arrive at that happy state under these laws, if the people may not give to the support of their work, even after it has been established? In their mad desire to kill off the Catholic Church, are not many of these reverend "generals" and "colonels" killing the goose that laid the golden egg for them? But what need they care? They no longer need the goose.



How does it come that General Villareal can utter such sentiments — utter them with impunity — and even win applause? It has come about because of a campaign of calumny, the most outrageous that has ever occurred in the history of the world. It is perfectly true that isolated examples can be found everywhere of priests who have been unfaithful to their holy obligations, as of ministers who have been anything but examples to their flocks; but that is only weak human nature occasionally showing itself. The overwhelming majority of the clergy of Mexico have been faithful, both to their vows and to their duties. Even Señor Zubaran, who attempted to reply to Cardinal O'Connell, acknowledges this of the rank and file of the country priests; but the most exemplary priests in Mexico are the hard-working priests of the populous city parishes; and the most pious of all have been the religious who were thrown out in a body. The most abominable stories have been circulated among the people of irregularities of the clergy, not forgetting even to slander individuals. For example, recently they sent through every Mexican paper accusations of rape against Father Vincente Latorre. His victim was supposed to be Miss Josefina Pimentel, and the priest was supposed to be in prison for his crime. The American-Mexican paper, *El Presente*, had the following about this charge in its issue of November 7, 1914:

"We have taken pains to investigate this, and information shows that it is untrue. Accusations of all kinds directed to the clergy in Mexico are

all too frequent, and, for reasons or pretext always unfounded, the Carranzistas have exiled them. Let us not forget the accusation made of finding arms and ammunition in the temple of Santo Domingo, which was found to be a great untruth and which the Carranzistas themselves had to correct.

"This is not a religious organ, nor have we any political agreement with the Church, but we aim to be defenders of truth and justice, and, therefore, believe the action of our colleagues a little hasty in accepting scandalous and untrue reports such as these.

"As regards Miss Pimentel, we are assured that she is not known in Mexico."



The editor states the truth. When the churches were looted, stories were given out that arms were found in them, skeletons of murdered people and skeletons of babies. No one in Mexico believes these stories except the ignorant; but they serve their purpose. Most of them are for American consumption, and American consumption only.

What are the facts regarding the condition of the Catholic Church in Mexico? Perhaps the best answer is the letter already quoted from the ladies of Yucatan. Read it over again; it is enlightening. Then add to it the following, which is the translation of a signed statement made to me, and now in my possession, by a lawyer from Mexico, a writer of distinction and note:

"I had not written to you, according to my promise, because I was awaiting the confirmation of some very important news from Mexico relating to a fact which fully corroborates an opinion of mine.

"This news has just been confirmed by my wife, who received it from the Superior of the ——— of Mexico City, who heard it from his confrères in Morelia.

"This city (Morelia) is the capital of Michoacan, a very rich and populous State (having more than one million inhabitants, and unequaled for agriculture and mining). It has for many years been noted for its fervent and solid piety.

"Gertrudis Sanchez, who took part in Madero's revolution, a coarse and irreligious man, ordered the expulsion of the Salesians of Don Bosco and the confiscation of their college. (I must tell you, by the way, that I am proud to have had the honor of materially aiding in the foundation of this useful establishment.)

"I forgot to tell you that this Sanchez, by the will and grace of Carranza, is now Governor of the State.

"The Salesians are greatly liked by the people, who uprose to defend them, armed with guns, clubs, stones, whatever was at hand, and so

intimidated the officials that they revoked the order, and for a few days left the poor exiles unmolested.

"But Sanchez, who had gone to Mexico City after this, and there held conference with Carranza, drinking courage at that fountain, on his return to Morelia, convoked, at night and by stealth, not only the Salesians, but the entire clergy, to whom he gave notice of expulsion, giving as a reason, of course, that they were making fanatics of the people.

"But the courageous population was ready, and several thousand men gathered in front of the Governor's palace. (Bear in mind that the city's population is 50,000.) All were armed as well as they could, all were prepared to fight and die, and when the Governor, trembling with rage (I do not say fear, for he is no coward), came out on the balcony and tried with fair words to calm the just riot, nothing could be heard but a shout from thousands of throats: 'Robber! outlaw! Godless wretch! Either leave our priests in peace or we will destroy your palace!'

"I believe that the soldiers of Sanchez sympathized with the people, for he himself, soulless as he is, made no attempt at resistance. On the contrary, he underwent the humiliation of having to revoke the decree, which had been orally given. The priests were carried in triumph to their houses by their brave deliverers, who have sworn never to permit such a savage and sacrilegious treatment of their clergy.

"The Carranzista papers said not a word about this, which occurred during this very month of October (the second uprising was on the 17th); but the fact is notorious, and will serve as a lesson to many other cities just as Catholic as Morelia. And this confirms my idea that a leader who would proclaim the fullest religious liberty, such as exists in the United States, and does great honor to that noble country, would have in his favor the strongest national elements, and the result would necessarily be most favorable, for he would have established a strong, prudent and patriotic government.

"If the American people would help us in this undertaking they would permanently cement the Christian alliance of two nations, and would deserve more glory for having procured freedom for our consciences than they already have for the emancipation of the negro.

"Further commentary is unnecessary. You, honored sir, will readily understand that I am right.

"You may publish this, if you like, but please do not mention my name or residence, for my family is still in Mexico, and those in power there are capable of anything!

"When my family (I do not know when!) will be at a safe distance, there is no fact to which I will not be ready to attest, and defend in every way."



But even far more interesting is the statement of a former Governor, himself a "Liberal." The statement was made before a notary in Texas, a copy of which is in the hands of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate at Washington. (A certified copy is in my possession.) The Governor resigned his high office, not because he was in sympathy with Huerta, but because he objected to Huerta's methods. He left his home for the sake of his two daughters. He states emphatically that the majority of the Mexican people are law-abiding and in favor of order. He states also that: "The Catholic Church, a few Protestant churches and all the other religious creeds of Mexico have never taken any part in this revolution." Again: "In order that you may understand that I am not untruthful and that I am not partial to priests, I will state that in politics I belong to the Benito Juarez party and I was always recognized as a member of the Liberal party. I have tried to practice the greatest respect toward the Catholic religion, and I know for certain that the priests of my State, after having suffered various vexations, and this without any motive or reason, have been exiled. We have had the good fortune of never having heard any scandal on the part of any of our clergy. The same may be said of the other religious sects. I repeat that never in any revolution has Mexico witnessed such barbarous excesses as in the present uprising, and I speak as one having experience, for I witnessed two and I fought on the side of Juarez. To-day there is no respect for any of the political divisions, or any religious body in Mexico. To me any man who is honest has a right to be respected, be he Catholic, Protestant or Jew. One may think "pro" or "con" about some ideas, but about stealing and killing there must be only one opinion.

"As regards the clergy, they have no power, no chance to favor the rich people rather than the poor. Besides, the greater part of the clergy in Mexico comes from the poorer classes. Furthermore, the idea of morality and justice is prevalent in the minds of our priests."



It is charged that the Church has kept the people of Mexico in ignorance, and that ninety per cent of these people are ignorant. The answer to this is very easy.

I need only call attention to the fact that the history of the Catholic Church in Mexico may be divided into only two chapters: one, the Church under Spanish influence; the other, the Church under the Republic. The idea of giving freedom to the Church rarely occurs to the Latin governmental mind. Its idea of the separation of Church and State never admits the possibility of the Church being free within the free State. The separation laws of France clearly show what I mean. Under the pretext of separation, a plan was introduced which, if accepted, would

have utterly destroyed the Church. The Latin statesman, when hungry, wants a chance to take a bite out of the Church. Nothing else will satisfy him. Under Spanish rule the Church had often to be used as far as possible to develop Spanish power. Later the Government seized churches, religious institutions and church property. It gave back the church buildings and some of the institutions, but on condition that it could keep the property and in reparation pay for the upkeep of religion. It took that burden, therefore, away from the Church, while indirectly keeping it upon the people. It made itself the gatherer of God's share, so that it could always keep its hands on the source of supply. It dictated appointments of bishops and pastors, and said how far the Church could go in carrying out her teaching mission. Its policy was to send to the colonies the unworthy clergymen, who were not wanted abroad. Bishops had no choice but to accept them. It hampered the Church on every side, and then blamed it for the consequences it had brought upon itself. In spite of this, the Church Christianized the people. But Spanish laws were enforced which did not suit the colonies. Nothing could be done without the consent of the Spanish monarch. Education was hampered; but, in spite of this, the Church established schools. The Franciscans and other missionaries placed schools side by side with their monasteries. At first the Indians did not go to them, but after a while their opposition was overcome. In 1524 there was not a single Indian who could read. Twenty years later, when Bishop Zumarraga wanted a book translated into the Indian tongue, he mentioned the good it might do, because "there are so many who know how to read." Pedro de Gante had a thousand children under his instruction, teaching them religion, music, singing and Latin. He began a school for grown-up people and founded another for fine arts and crafts. Some of the schools had as many as from eight hundred to a thousand pupils. In spite of the difficulties, the Church did all she could, and the Government as little as possible.

When the Revolution came, and with it the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez, an end came also to what little freedom the Church had. She was despoiled of such possessions as had been left her. She was forbidden to teach, which means to open schools of any kind, except of theology. Her ministers even could not dress as clerics. The law of May 13, 1873, forbade any religious demonstration outside of a church building, and forbade clergymen or Sisters to dress in any way that would indicate their calling. The Constitution of 1857 interfered with personal liberty to the extent of forbidding anybody to enter a religious Order, and refused religious Orders a legal right to hold property. The law of July 12, 1859, suppressed religious Orders and religious societies, forbade the foundation of new congregations, ordered all books, manuscripts,

prints and antiquities belonging to such Orders to be given up. The law of February 26 suppressed female communities. The law of July 12, 1859, took away all property from the clergy; but that of February 5, 1861, returned to the Church its parochial residences, bishops' houses, etc. Then September 25, 1873, saw a new law which forbade any religious institution to acquire property or the revenue derived from it. The law of December 14, 1874, struck at the right of the clergy to receive legacies. The law of July 31, 1859, took away from the clergy the right to manage or have anything to do with cemeteries. The law of February 2, 1861, took from the Church her hospitals and charitable institutions, as also did a law of February 28 of the same year. To make it more certain that the Church could not be charitable, the law of August 27, 1904, forbade clergymen to act as directors and administrators, or patrons of private charities, and extended this decree even to include those delegated by clergymen. It will clearly be seen that, under the Constitution and Laws of Reform, the clergy had little power left, and the Church little chance to uplift the people. A Mexican archbishop has written: "Not only was the Church despoiled of her ancient properties and oppressed by tyrannical laws, but the situation was rendered more difficult later on by the Law of Public Instruction." However, General Diaz permitted some educational foundations, seeking his authority under the Law of Private Beneficence; but under this law, even if the priests themselves wished to found a work of charity, they had to leave religion out of it. Yet, in spite of it all, some schools were founded — many, in fact — but always under the danger of information being laid against their directors and persecution following. A Mexican bishop, now in exile, told me that Mexican Catholics who desire to give religious instruction to their children have to go the length of "seeing" the secular schoolmaster, and even bribing him not to tell on them. Still, one religious Order had over four million dollars invested in schools and colleges. The Constitutionals took it all, but left the mortgages for the Order to pay. Then they assassinated the professors of Zacatecas, destroyed the libraries, etc.



All these unjust laws are the more to be regretted when it is known that only the Church can educate or civilize the Indians. With the Indian the civil power is impotent. The Indian is religious. He may be deceived into revolution, but it must be deception that brings him into it. Carranza's troops told the Indians that they were fighting against a certain Mr. Clergyman (Don Clero), and the Indian was always looking for this tyrant, not knowing that it was the Church the Carranzistas meant. The suppression of the flourishing missions of the Jesuits and the Franciscans in the north of Mexico, at the end of the eighteenth century, resulted

either in the complete extinguishing of these Indians or their return to barbarism. Within the last few years missions among the Indians started again; but now they are destroyed. What must be said of the "patriotism" that, in a country where ninety per cent of the people are illiterate, destroys, or attempts to destroy, the only power that has shown its ability to do the work of civilization? They may advance theories by the bushel, but there is no theory regarding the work of the Church. A business man does not desert his true and tried methods of securing business. He tests his theories before he replaces the old by the new. Mexico, fifty years ago, embarked in a new venture. The result has been constant revolution, murder, destruction of property, and crimes which cry to heaven for vengeance; and now those responsible ask the world to believe that it is all done in the name of liberty, and that the Church which their forerunners reduced to impotence is responsible for it.

The revolutionists frankly directed their efforts against the rich as well as against the clergy. They demanded the forcible impoverishment of the wealthy class, without due process of law and without compensation. They have put this into force wherever they could. They have seized haciendas, forcibly entered homes and drove the owners and their families on the streets, moving in themselves. Now they insist that the clergy catered to the rich, and are, therefore, become the enemies of the poor. They forget that it is the province of the Church to aid and comfort the poor, and that the only means she has for doing it is her influence in securing the money for carrying on her work from those who have it to give. She has, therefore, always in history stood between the rich and the poor. If this were not her position, how could she establish her hospitals, schools, orphanages, and a thousand other works of charity? Even in the United States the cry goes up that the Church (by which is meant all Christian religious effort) should devote itself more to philanthropy and less to the cultivation of simple piety. In other words, the demand is being made that the Church more than ever must devote herself to securing from the rich the means to alleviate suffering. How could religion answer that demand if its enemies charge that it caters to the rich when it begs from them? In Mexico the Constitutionals not only kill the Church because they say she does no good, but, on the other hand, they kill her when she does do good.



During the Spanish régime in Mexico the Church maintained as friendly a relation with the State as was possible. If she had not maintained such relations her voice would never have been heard in court. It was the influence of the Church that secured a hearing for Las Casas against the oppressors of the Indians. To-day in Mexico the Church has

no influence. A new Las Casas could accomplish nothing; but the Church has had some influence with property-holders, which was always used to favor the poor. The only mitigation of the hard lot of some of the peons was won by the influence of the Church over individuals.

The Constitutionalist insist that the people of Mexico are against the Church; yet, when the churches are opened, they are crowded. In more than one case the persecutors had to stop their fury in fear of an uprising among the people, who crowded around the exiled priests until the leaders were terrified. But the same leaders took good care in the next place that the people could not menace them, for they took away their weapons.

The Zapata revolution is a case in point. Zapata has held two States in a grip of iron. His revolution is popular. His soldiers are the only ones who show a disposition to work. They have taken up land and they are cultivating it. A short time ago I met a prominent gentleman, Mexican, who had gone through the entire length of Zapata's territory in carriage and on horseback. He scarcely saw a soldier. People were working in their fields. The Church in Zapata's territory has not been molested. Churches are open, and one of the bishops, at this writing, is actually out on his confirmation tour. If the Revolution is a popular uprising against the Church, why is it that Zapata holds his power through the popularity of his movement with the people, though he has made no attack whatever upon the Church and religion? Some excesses have been committed by Zapatists, it is true, but by the camp-followers. None of the exiles I met have charged Zapata with responsibility for them. On the contrary, they warmly defended him, and stated that when outrages have been committed neither Zapata himself nor the general run of his people had any responsibility for them. On the other hand, outrages by Constitutionalist had been fomented by the most abominable calumnies, and by the leaders themselves. They manufactured plots out of whole cloth. "Conspiracies by the clergy," never even thought of before the troops entered, were announced even before the Constitutionalist had had time to make an investigation.

The cry in this revolution has been a cry for vengeance against the assassins of Madero. Carranza himself makes this his rallying cry, forgetting that he himself was against Madero and intended leading a revolution against him. The opportunity which arose through Madero's death did not change his mind about a revolution, but changed the details. Now he charges the clergy with having coöperated in the assassination of Madero. His proof is that the clergy recognized Madero's government. How much truth is there in this statement?

The revolution which ended in the assassination of Madero lasted ten days. It came on suddenly and without warning. These days are called

the "Ten Tragic Days." The outbreak occurred in the City of Mexico, and was practically confined to that city. If the clergy were in league to bring about the downfall of Madero, it might be expected that the revolution would have been general. What time did the clergy have to compass their ends in ten days, and what object could they have had for bringing about the downfall of *the first government in fifty years which permitted free elections*, by means of which the Catholic party, it is conceded, would have been placed in power? The downfall of Madero was a blow to the interests of religion. It is perfectly true that the bishops and clergy recognized the government of Huerta. What else could they do? He had been placed in power according to the laws and Constitution of Mexico. He had been recognized by the Congress, the Senate, the Supreme Court and the diplomatic corps, including the American Minister. The Church stands for lawful authority. When that authority is in power it is the duty of the Church to accept it and live under it. This is exactly what was done. It is not the business of the Church to foment revolution. The clergy had no right to put Huerta on trial. Neither the laws of Mexico nor their own obligation as priests assigned to them any such duty. The Church wanted peace, and accepted Huerta as she had accepted Madero. Had she done otherwise, there might have been a lawful charge against her of fostering rebellion; but against the Church the charges will be made anyhow. The hatreds of man for man are unaccountable enough, but there is a still more unaccountable hatred of man for God, and all that represents Him.



I have seen a document issued by the Constitutionalist representatives in New York City, attempting to prove that the Church was playing politics. The letter is dated July 11, 1913. It is from Archbishop Mora of Mexico City to Señor Urrutia. The Archbishop said: "I beg to assure you once more that all the curates and priests under my jurisdiction, in compliance with their duty, will make every effort, in order to bring about, as soon as possible, the fulfillment of the aspirations of all the good people in this Republic, who desire the peace and tranquillity of the beloved country. I say that they do so in compliance with their duty, because the Church desires peace and to avoid bloodshed, and that all coöperate to the ultimate object of society, which is the well-being of all its members." Is there anything in these words that indicates more than a desire to work under the existing form of government, with an object of bringing peace to the country? This is the evidence put forth by the representatives of the Constitutionlists themselves to justify murder, exile, imprisonment and unspeakable outrages against the innocent. What decent court could accept such evidence? Did even

Robespierre send a single person to the guillotine on such testimony? If he did, who wants to be classed with Robespierre?

Truth is that the Constitutionals have gone forward without even a probability of evidence. They have gone forward in the face of a pastoral letter, issued by a number of bishops in the City of Mexico, protesting vigorously, while Huerta was still in power, that neither the Church nor the clergy had mixed up in revolution or in political matters. As one Mexican archbishop said to me: "These men have adopted the cry of Voltaire, 'Fling mud; some of it will stick.'" They fling the mud in such generous quantities that some of it is bound to stick; even in the face of the fact that Huerta himself, whom the Church was supposed to uphold, gave out a law of oppression concerning ecclesiastical property, and suppressed Catholic newspapers, among them *La Nacion*, the organ of the Catholic party, simply because this party refused him votes. He exiled its president and persecuted its members; yet they charge that he was the candidate of the Catholics themselves.

VII.

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES AGAINST THE CHURCH IN MEXICO.

The assertion that the recent revolution in Mexico was financed and the revolutionists armed by capitalists in the United States, one meets constantly and hears on every side. I have never heard it denied, even in our own country. Americans do not take the trouble to deny what they believe to be true. With that situation I have nothing at all to do. As a citizen of the United States I deeply regret it, but my present discussion concerns chiefly the outrages against religion.

The charge that the Government of the United States directly aided and abetted the revolutionists I do not entirely believe. I have too high a regard for President Wilson to concede anything of the kind. I do believe that he was mistaken; but I also believe that, for the mistake, biased information and biased investigators were mainly responsible. I believe that men sent by the President to report facts as they found them reported visionary dreams of things as they wanted them. I believe it, too, on the testimony of honorable men, who had more opportunity of knowing the actual condition of things in Mexico than these strangers, some of whom could not even speak the language of the country, but who allowed their own bigotry to taint their judgment. Señor Frisbie, an American and the son of General Frisbie, who spent nearly all of his life in Mexico, informed me that, on a Ward Line boat for New York, he met the wife of one of these representatives, who was himself on the boat, returning to report to the President, and that this lady said to him, not knowing that he was a Catholic, that "the priests and nuns should be driven out of Mexico." Another of these representatives made similar statements in Vera Cruz to a gentleman whose letter I have in my possession. But all that is neither here nor there. It concerns the political situation, which, so far as this book is concerned, is no affair of mine.

Two outside influences were exerted, and have been exerted for years, to the injury of the Catholic Church in Mexico. One of these is the influence of secret societies and the other the influence of a section of American Protestantism.



Concerning the influence of the first, the following editorial, taken from the *New York Times* of November 8, 1914, will be enlightening:

"The reappearance as a threatening factor in Mexican politics of Scottish Rite Masonry is a phenomenon which merits a word of present

comment. In 1824, with the very beginning of modern Mexico, the two principal political factions were allied either with the Scottish or York Rites of Masonry. The Scottish Rite had grown up under Spanish influence and was all-powerful until our first diplomatic representative in the young republic, Joel Poinsett of South Carolina, remembered now chiefly as the botanist who gave his name to the poinsetta, founded the York Rite purely as a political factor. The lodges of the Yorkinos, who were much less exclusive than the Escoseses, multiplied rapidly and exerted all the influence of the various branches of an American political machine. Of course, Poinsett was not authorized by our Government to meddle in Mexican politics or to extend the influence of Masonry in Mexico, and his imprudence eventually led to his recall. But for many years Masonry exerted a strong factional force throughout the country, and the sudden reappearance of the Scottish Rite, in a pronunciamiento against the United States Government for not withdrawing the troops from Vera Cruz without conditions, suggests that Masonry may have been exerting its influence quietly in the upheavals of the last four years.

"Of course, the historic Masonry of Mexico took on its political purpose accidentally. The order of Scotch Masons was largely composed of men of Spanish blood, the aristocracy of the country which had thrown off the foreign yoke, put its first Emperor to death, and asserted itself as a self-governed community. They worked together for protection. But Poinsett's York Grand Lodge was founded deliberately with political intent and inevitably lent fresh political strength to the older lodge. The survival or the revival of Masonry as a force in politics in Mexico is interesting, and may be important. The report that all the signers of the inflammatory document have been put in jail indicates that the authorities in Mexico City do not view favorably the intrusion of secret societies in politics."



I do not, in publishing the above editorial, desire to make charges against the rank and file of the membership of the American Masonic body. I am not unaware of the fact that Masonry in the United States is considered by the great majority of its members as nothing more than a fraternal or social organization; but Masons themselves in America have recognized the fact that the Masonic body all over the world does not hold the same ideals. It will be remembered that some years ago, a protest was made by a Masonic body in Canada to the English Grand Master (at that time the Prince of Wales, who afterward became King Edward VII.) against the establishment in Montreal of lodges operating under a charter from the Grand Orient of France. Their objection was based upon the fact that such lodges were anti-Christian, while Masonry under

British jurisdiction held belief in God to be a fundamental condition for membership. Their protest was ineffectual, for the foreign lodges were established, and, as a matter of fact, exist to-day. It will also be remembered that only three or four years ago, when Montreal was preparing for the great Eucharistic Congress, which would bring to the city Catholic prelates, priests and laymen from all over the world, and was, as a matter of fact, the largest convention the city was ever called upon to handle, it was discovered that one of these foreign lodges deliberately planned to direct visiting priests to houses of ill-fame instead of to respectable boarding-houses, and afterward to have the places raided, so as to make it appear that priests had chosen such residences during their stay at Montreal. The exposure of the whole plot was made in the public press of Montreal. If proof is needed that American Masons know that universal Masonry is something entirely different from their own ideals, it is found in the acknowledgment of the British and American lodges themselves, whose members claim openly that they have no affiliation with what we might call Latin Masonry, which includes the Masonry of Mexico and South America. I have talked with hundreds of American Masons, and every one has the same statement to make, that Latin Masons would not be received in American lodges. However, this statement is not entirely true, though those who make it believe that it is. Even Latin Masonry is divided. In Italy, where Latin Masonry is strong, the division exists; and the point of difference is the question of political activity and infidelity. As an illustration, it may be remembered that when Mr. Theodore Roosevelt visited Rome he received representatives of one body of Italian Masons, headed by Baron Fava, as brothers. Representatives of the other had no such recognition. Now, no one for an instant dreams that Theodore Roosevelt, Mason, would affiliate himself with men who aim at the destruction of order and who deny the existence of God, any more than any one would believe that William H. Taft, Mason, could do the same thing. There are numberless American Masons who have not only been most friendly with their Catholic fellow-citizens, but are even sincere admirers of the Catholic Church. No one believes that these men have any desire to see her influence destroyed, her charities broken up, and her children left without religious direction of any kind. We may safely absolve the great body of American Masons from the charge of knowingly injuring the Church in Mexico.

Nevertheless, it is true that, from the great body of American Masons, some men have been selected who are in sympathy with the irreligious propaganda of Latin Masonry; and there is every reason to believe that, through these men, Masonic influence has wrought injury to religion in Mexico. How far this has gone no one can tell, but that representatives

of the United States have fraternized with the Masons in Mexico is openly charged by the Mexicans themselves. I have a letter from which this remarkable statement is taken: "When the Masons in Mexico called on United States Masons to get us out of Vera Cruz, I knew," etc.



What evidence my informant had I do not know. Having been in Vera Cruz practically from the beginning of American occupation, he was in a position to learn things that I could not possibly have learned. The point I desire to make is, that American Masons, viewing their society purely as a fraternal and social organization, can scarcely blame the Church for objecting when all we know of Masonry, outside of British and American possessions, is that the fraternity stands before the people as religion's unqualified and unrelenting enemy, through whose influence murders, robberies, exilings and worse have been perpetrated, not only in Mexico, but also in Portugal. It is a recognized fact in both Italy and France that Masonry stands for irreligion and the total destruction of the Catholic Church.

In Mexico, though Porfirio Diaz was himself a Mason, yet during his dictatorship the lodges were greatly reduced in membership. When Madero came into power there was a campaign for active reorganization. This campaign sought recruits not only among the middle class, but also among the workingmen. Before the revolution entered cities, the lodges fiercely attacked the Catholic religion, through calumnies from press and platform. Their members served as spies and informers, and even exposed the hiding-places of the priests and of the sacred vessels. This is not a guess. It is an admitted fact all over Mexico.

El Liberal, the official organ of Carranza, can be quoted as an authority upon this point.

It charges that the Church in Mexico wants American intervention, in spite of the fact that two archbishops have issued letters as patriotic as any statements ever given out in Mexico, and in spite of the fact that not one of the churchmen who are refugees here would even consider the idea of upholding intervention. The Mexican bishops and priests are Mexicans and patriotic men.

"It is indispensable," says *El Liberal*, "that to accomplish our determination a strong call be made to the followers of truth to come to the line to fight for victory or death, for liberty and fraternity in the temples consecrated by triumphs and inexplicable abnegations—the lodges. . . . We Mexican lovers of liberty, equality and fraternity, let us hasten to join the army of the defense of these ideals. Let us work in our lodges toward its realization."

When I charge that a section of American Protestantism has played an evil part in the Mexican persecution, I do not intend to charge my Protestant fellow-citizens in general with the crime. There are some thirty million people in the United States who have allied themselves in some way with Protestantism. Most of these meet their Catholic fellow-citizens socially and in a business way every day. They live at peace with them, and they ask for nothing better than that this condition continue. They are willing to grant to others the liberty of conscience which they desire for themselves. They know their Catholic fellow-citizens. They have confidence in them. Many of their families are allied with Catholic families by marriage or ties of blood. They contribute to Catholic charities, and often generously at that. They believe the Catholic Church has a mission in the United States, and they look upon the Church as having given a notable contribution to the peace and prosperity of this Republic. In American wars they have fought side by side with Catholic soldiers, as to-day they work side by side with Catholic men and women in the daily duties of life. It is far from my thought to charge such men and women with complicity in the outrages perpetrated in Mexico.

Still there is another section, representing the uneducated and bigoted sectarians among Protestants. Nothing less than the total destruction of the Catholic Church in America would satisfy them, and to bring about such a result they would not hesitate at all to revive the iniquities of past ages, when religion was so bound up with the politics of nations that in her name thousands were sent to their death. This section has many papers and magazines devoted to the cause of religious enmity. One of these papers has a circulation of a million and a half. Decent Protestants have protested against this situation. They have been horrified at the vile calumnies these organs of bigotry fling at the Church and her priesthood. Their protest has been voiced time and again by such men as Dr. Washington Gladden. The secular papers will not print their tirades, but still they go on with their work. They scatter their infamous libels. They call the Pope "the Chief of White Slavers." They brand priests as monsters of iniquity. They declare our religious houses to be dens of prostitution. They put the mark of shame upon pure and virtuous Catholic womanhood, a mark which the worst libertine is willing to declare, from his own experience, to be notoriously undeserved. The papers printing such libels freely circulate through our mails at second-class rates. Consequently they are virtually subsidized by the Government and Catholics themselves are taxed to uphold them. The Dominion of Canada has refused permission to circulate such papers through its post-offices, or even through other carriers. We permit it all in the name of a free press; but it is not liberty of the press that we are granting, but the beginning of unbridled license. ✝

The vile calumnies of these people have been circulated in Mexico. Their lurid tales have been printed in Spanish, with the intention of swaying Mexican Catholics from their allegiance to the Church. They have preached in Mexico through Protestant missionaries that the United States is a Protestant nation, but Protestant in their own sense; so that whatever is done against the Catholic Church surely meets with approval. A court of the Guardians of Liberty, the bigoted society which has General Miles for its leader, sent to Villa the following letter:

"Alamo Court, No. 1, Guardians of Liberty of Texas, a patriotic organization of American citizens, with courts throughout the entire United States, which has for its purpose the maintaining of the United States Constitution and the complete separation of Church and State, desires to express to you, and other patriotic Mexicans, our hearty approval of your actions and the great good and service you have and are rendering your people and the country.

"We would especially commend your actions in ridding your country of the basest of human vultures, the Catholic priesthood. Whenever women are forced to secretly confess to a man who has never married, and knows nothing of the sacredness of woman or of home, it is but natural for immorality to exist, and until this practice is stopped it is impossible to raise up a liberty-loving, intelligent, patriotic, moral generation.

"Again assuring you of our appreciation of your invaluable worth to your country, and trusting that you may continue your good work until the people of your country are freed, indeed, from the root of the trouble, the Roman Catholic Church, in the language of the patriot, we would exclaim, 'Viva Mexico by Villa!'"



This was openly offering the encouragement which we very well knew had been for a long time extended secretly. All of these things are done in the name of American Protestantism, and done in such a way as to make American Protestants responsible for them. Protestant missions in Mexico have their share of the blame for the persecutions. For years they have been working, but their achievements have been practically nil. By this time people ought to know from experience that the Latin is a Catholic or nothing. When he loses his allegiance to the Church he becomes an infidel or an atheist. Such a being as an indifferentist can hardly find room to breathe among Latin people. The Latin must be one thing or the other. Those who are swayed from the Catholic Faith by Protestant missionary efforts land in the ranks of open infidelity, enemies to all religion. What triumph is it for Protestantism

that France persecuted the Catholic Church, when Viviani declared that his task was to "blot out the stars from heaven"? What triumph did Protestantism gain from the new birth of atheism in Portugal? If Protestants believe that the Catholic Church is Christian at all, why do they follow a plan which they know will destroy Christianity with the Church? Can any one answer these questions? To me they are mysteries beyond solution. In Mexico former Protestant ministers are to-day "generals, colonels and captains." The Provisional President, Guiterrez, is said to be an ex-Protestant minister. The revolutionary governors of two states were Protestant ministers. Almost to a man have these former salaried officials of American Protestant missionary societies entered the ranks of revolutionists.

VIII.

A LAST WORD.

This story I have written down as I received it from the mouths of eye-witnesses. I am well aware of the fact that due allowance must be made for natural resentment in those who were the victims of injustice toward their persecutors. I have no objection to the reader making his own allowance in this regard, and making the allowance as generously as he pleases. There still remain the great facts of the case: the murder, exile, imprisonment, rape and robbery of the innocent. Nations often have in history been built on a foundation of crime, but we all had hope that the enlightened twentieth century would have nothing to add to the evil record. In making your allowances will the reader please weigh these, some findings of my own, to the evidence?

First. In all my conversations with the refugees, lay and clerical, I met but few who were not enlightened men and women, many highly educated, all sober and serious, some speaking many languages, most of them graduates of colleges and universities — in short, the kind of people the average American citizen likes to know, and feels honored in knowing.

Second. Among these refugees I found but one who disliked Mexico and would not return there under any circumstance. In justice to him, however, I must state that he was not a Mexican citizen, and that he had private reasons of his own for the dislike, reasons which any red-blooded man would justify sentimentally, if not logically. All the others loved Mexico and wanted nothing better than the opportunity to return to their native land. They desire peace and the reign of law. Their passionate attachment to their country might well be envied by our more matter-of-fact sort of patriotism.

Third. Not one Mexican with whom I conversed desired the intervention of the United States, if such intervention meant the loss to his country of her independence. The utmost limit of their concession to the necessity of intervention was for that kind of intervention which would guarantee beforehand the integrity of their nation, and her freedom as soon as peace was restored and a just and stable government set up. They all believed that the United States could well be a sister, but never a successful stepmother to Mexico.

Fourth. I found that every one of these refugees had lost all suspicion of American motives, even though condemning what they consid-

ered our "mistakes" in dealing with Mexican problems. They had learned that our motives, that is, the motives of the great mass of the American people, were good.

Fifth. The charitable and fraternal action of American Catholics deeply touched the refugees, and, learning of the liberty of conscience enjoyed in this Republic, their admiration increased with their gratitude. I could not help thinking that this argues more for the prosperity of future trade relations than the cruel policy of concession-grabbers, whose money and influence have deluged Mexico with innocent blood. A foundation is now laid for a brotherly feeling between Americans and Mexicans. Love will build up what cupidity has destroyed.



On these things, as well as on the facts before presented, let me base my last word about Mexico to my fellow-citizens, Protestant and Catholic.

There is need in the world to-day of an enlightened nation, honoring God, loving peace and presenting ideals of true liberty, whose very existence will be a rebuke to lawlessness, and whose greatest message is the old message of faith, hope and charity. There is need in this Western world of a great nation, whose glory is not in conquest by arms, or even conquest in commerce, but rather in a spirit of justice and fraternity which permeates all its people. We all think that the United States comes nearer both ideals than any nation yet born to the earth; but, alas! her sister nations on this Western hemisphere look at her with suspicion not unmixed with fear. To them she is "The Colossus of the North," whose sons come only to extort riches, while scorning their people, berating their convictions, mocking their religion, and often fomenting bloody discords. Have we any idea how deeply many of our fellow-citizens have gone in encouraging and paying for the frequent revolutions of which we speak so often with such contempt?

We, who love to think that we regard the rights of conscience above all other rights, do we reflect on the fact that, in our name and to the flaunting of our flag, we send to the neighbors whose good will we desire to cultivate, men who tell them that their ideals of centuries must be abandoned, that their methods of worshiping God are idolatrous, that their own sons in the clergy are moral lepers, that their own daughters who have adopted the religious state are dupes and prostitutes, that their shrines are abominations, that their love for God is a sham?

Do we ever reflect that Spanish civilization has had a more difficult task than "Anglo-Saxon" civilization in the Americas, in that it was "handicapped" by the inexorable Faith which forced the conqueror to *preserve* and not *destroy* the conquered, and, thus limited, could not *colonize* one-tenth as much as attempt to *civilize*? Do we give the

Spanish conqueror of Indian nations credit for the fact that, when he brought his Church with him he was hampering the exercise of his own power, by religion's demand to give the Indian the right to live? Does he not sometimes stop to think what would be the condition even of these United States had the conquerors here preserved the Indian to the extent of outnumbering the whites ten to one? Could we expect anything better, under such conditions, than Mexico has, and some other Spanish republics have, to-day?



Let us be fair. Spain *preserved* where we *destroyed*. With a constantly diminishing Indian population, wards of the State, having schools and colleges for all who wish to enter them, what one of our Indians has ever shown the governmental and military genius of a Diaz, the intelligent bravery of a Mejia, the surgical ability of a Urrutia, the philosophical knowledge of a Munguia, the science of a Carrillo y Azcona, the theological training of an Alarcon, the poetic fire of an Altamirano, the political acumen of an Estagnol, the legal and journalistic career of Sanchez Santos, the artistic talents of Panduro and Velazquez? Indians? Yes, all Indians, pure-blooded Indians. Name those of ours whose genius has made such marks on the history of our country. Sitting Bull? Geronimo? Alas! such a beginning speaks badly for an ending. Think this over before you condemn Spanish civilization in the Americas. We have little to show for one hundred years of "Anglo-Saxon" attempts to uplift our Indians. Yet the Indians of Mexico have produced men of letters, artists, statesmen, soldiers, scientists, learned bishops and priests—men of genius. But for all of that Spain's government was not responsible. The credit belongs to the maligned Church, which stood out, with Fray Las Casas, Fray Martin of Valencia, and Bishop Juan de Zumarraga, for the rights of the natives, and sacrificed their entire lives for their conversion, civilization and protection. What if there still remain some of the ancient superstitions? Have we, the enlightened, gotten rid entirely of ours? What of the Wall street broker who still trusts the clairvoyant before his brains, who will not fling his hat on a hotel bed because the action is supposed to be unlucky? What of the thirteen-at-table nonsense, or the fear of beginning a work on Friday? The missionaries of Mexico did not transplant *Spaniards* to Mexican soil to grow a garden without seeding and to dispossess the wild beauty already there. They seeded the ground anew, and grafted religion and civilization to plants their colonies already had. Thus they worked to gradually clear off the ancient superstitions. We tried to burn off our Indians' superstitions, and our Indians went fast with them. We transplanted England and Ireland, Scotland and Germany here; but the Indians who yet live have still their

superstitions. They are dying, in many cases, with them. It's a different story, that of Mexico and that of our country; but, for the ancient people of both, those of Mexico have the greater reason for gratitude.

When Sir Lionel Carden, the British Ambassador to Mexico under Huerta, left this country for England, he expressed sympathy for the "decent people" of Mexico. Do we even think of these "decent people" when we give our unqualified sympathy to hordes of bandits, whose past records alone would be *prima facie* presumption of guilt in any court of justice in our country? Are "liberators" made of such material? For two generations have the old colleges and universities of Mexico been closed and new ones substituted; yet to-day we find Mexico's best people sending their children, almost by stealth, to the few religious schools that have stolen back, and, when that is not possible, to schools of the same kind in Spain and the United States. Francisco Madero himself was a pupil of Mt. St. Mary's College in Maryland; Carranza a constant and friendly visitor to the College of the Jesuits in Saltillo. The man in whom both our Government and our people placed its highest hopes for peace in Mexico was the Christian De la Barra; and next to him the Christian convert, Gamboa.



Susan Hale, in her history of Mexico, says: "It is evident that what is needed is good government, good religion and good education." But we have, alas! by our own greed and our prejudice, made government a thing to be fought for by robbers; of religion a thing to be held up to scorn and insult; of the old schools, that once were glorious, barracks and ruins. We listen and applaud when the "liberals" of every camp tell us that the Church is responsible for poverty, ignorance and lawlessness; but we do not listen to the Church which gave to Mexico all the civilization she possesses, when she makes this gentle plaint, over the noise of murder, debauchery and lust: You blame me for poverty, yet you took from me the endowments for my hospitals, my orphanages, my countless works of mercy. You blame me for ignorance, when you closed my schools, stole my colleges and suppressed my universities which first lit the torch of learning among this people. You say I have added nothing to science and art, but you destroyed the art I brought with me, burned my books and scattered the results of my labor for science to the four winds of heaven. You blame me for ignorance after forbidding me for fifty years to teach. You blame me for lawlessness, when you destroyed my missions among a peaceful and thriving Indian population, and gave, in my place to the people, the thirty pieces of silver with which you bribed them to murder their fellows. You took the cross out of their hands to replace it with a torch and a gun. Show me one good thing in

Mexico I did not give you. Show me one genius for whom I was not responsible. Show me one step in advance I did not help you to take. Cut away from your country all that I put in it, and see what remains. You may thrust me out, exile my bishops, murder my priests, again steal my schools, desecrate my sanctuaries and my virgins, but you can not blot out history, you can not erase the mark I have left on you — not in a century of centuries.

If the United States is to be the friend and sister of Mexico, to the advantage of both, our citizens must rid themselves of a multitude of inherited prejudices, and substitute a spirit of understanding for a spirit of greed. There is more to be had in Mexico than oil and mining concessions: there is the good will that makes such concessions a logical consequence of a desire for help and a manifestation of deep gratitude. I have no wish to condemn business enterprise, but it is poor business that depends for success on machine guns. If powder and ball are the things we want to dispose of to Mexico, the question arises: which country is the less civilized, the one that sells or the one that buys? We scorn to learn the language of Mexico, yet we expect to talk to her people so that they will understand. Pardon me, but *do* they understand when we talk from the black mouths of cannon?

Mexicans do need "good government," and we have the opportunity now of giving it to them, not by imposing our views upon them, not by taking away their independence, but by telling them fairly and honestly that we will help no government set up by thieves, nor any government that is not founded on the principles of equal justice to all. Mexico can not get along without a big brother yet; but a big brother who lets his little brother fall into a well to drown is a poor excuse for a brother at all.

Yes, Mexico needs "good religion." She has the Mother Church of Christendom in her midst, but chained and bound by laws that were intended to kill her. But Mexico's history shows that she will accept no other religion. American Protestantism has tried for fifty years to supplant the Catholic Church, but has not succeeded in doing any more than the work of enlarging the number of atheists and indifferentists. These missions are making no friends for us, but rather causing resentment against us. Their very presence is taken as an insult by the enlightened people, who can not but think that we regard them as heathen. Unbind the Church of their Fathers, the Church of Las Casas; give her again the right to teach and to preach; let her build her missions anew with a guarantee that they shall stand, not as relics of past greatness, but as living, acting agencies for the uplift of the Indians and their advance to greater things.

Yes, Mexico needs "good education." Then make every educational work free, under democratic and wise laws. See that the teacher is not penalized, his work destroyed, and his endowments seized by rapacious banditti. Give help to every effort for the instruction of the masses. Follow Washington's advice to encourage the means of education. It works well with us; why should it be disregarded in Mexico? Would we in these United States think of confiscating the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in private educational endowments for the universities of Harvard or Yale or Chicago or Princeton, because they are private and not state institutions; would we think of killing off the endowments of human devotion and self-sacrifice of Washington, Georgetown and Notre Dame, because they are religious institutions? Then why give approval by a pleased look or a smirking silence, when these same things are done in Mexico by bandits with American weapons in their hands?



Mexico lies prostrate to-day. Anarchy reigns. Religion is over half destroyed. Greed steals the very school books from the children. Capital is fleeing. Labor gladly grasps a gun, and works at killing for pay. Virgins put on mourning for the worse than death that has befallen them. The country lifts her head to look at us with eyes that are more than half reproachful, but, thank God, there is also hope in them. We have our opportunity, one that, taken now at the flood, leads on to better than fortune. All South America, the South America we want to win to our side, the South America we need, is watching us, to see if our good offices must be bought by gold, by the sacrifice of hallowed and holy traditions. This hour is the hour full of fate for us. Shall we grasp the full measure of its pregnant possibilities?

The Speech of the Silent Man

A REPLY TO MR. JOHN LIND

When a silent man puts his thoughts into language, the world expects something. When that silent man happens to have been the Governor of a State and the trusted personal representative of the ruler of what we believe to be the greatest nation on earth, we expect something of tremendous importance. When that silent man, who had been a Governor, etc., has a wise face to match his silence, as becometh a University Regent, we expect, when he speaks, to shed new light on any question, of sufficient "pith and moment" to wring speech out of him.

In all these things has Mr. John Lind disappointed us. The public has been devoured with curiosity regarding his report to the President on the Mexican crisis. Attempts have been made, even in Congress, to find out what the report contained; but the attempts failed. Mr. Lind has been importuned to speak, but he has spoken only on private occasions, or at semi-private banquets with all reporters barred. But at last Mr. Lind has given his views to the world. He has taken his time about it, presumably so that it might be understood they were the result of deep study and thought. Months and months have elapsed since he returned from Mexico, and only now (December, 1914) has he made his views public. In *The Bellman* of December 5, and again in the same magazine of December 12, Mr. Lind tells what he thinks of Mexico and her people. I have read the articles, and after reading them have put them down with anything but a feeling of satisfaction. It would have been better for Mr. Lind to have maintained his dignified silence. "The mountain was in labor and produced a mouse." No, that is not exactly the case. The mouse was produced all right; but the mountain was only a mole hill, and the mole hill itself is now nothing more than a mirage.

Mr. Lind's article quite naturally divides itself into two parts: one dealing with the historic side, and the other giving what might be called the personal side, because it gives Mr. Lind's own personal opinions upon the situation. I am going to take up both sides separately.

THE HISTORICAL SIDE.

The historical part of Mr. Lind's article is absolutely worthless; first, because it is not Mr. Lind's at all, and, secondly, because it is not true. Most of it is taken, with only a half attempt at paraphrasing, from an article written by E. B. Tylor, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., for the *Encyclopedia*

Britannica, and which was published in the ninth edition, A. D. 1888, Volume 16, pp. 210 to 213. Of course, there is absolutely no reason why Mr. Lind should not have consulted an Encyclopedia to verify his original research, or his own studies; but it is absolutely puerile for a man who avowedly poses as an authority on Mexico, after having spent months in that country on one of the most important missions within the gift of the American Government, to take practically all his facts from an Encyclopedia, and even, in many cases, borrow the very language of the book itself. Any schoolboy can copy an article from an Encyclopedia; but if he attempted to hand in such an article, even paraphrased, to an examining board, his youth could scarcely save him from censure. Mr. Lind is no youth. He is no schoolboy, but he evidently has lost none of the schoolboy tricks. I select a few lines from Dr. Tylor and a few lines from Mr. Lind, to show the deadly parallel:

MR. LIND:

"Below the king was a numerous and powerful class of nobles."

"A rich and powerful merchant class."

"Great estates were owned by the crown."

"Slavery existed, but in a rather mild form. The children of slaves were born free."

"There was a Supreme Court for the cognizance of law appeals, located in the palace, in the city of Mexico. There were inferior tribunals in the principal cities, over each of which a Supreme Judge presided. These judges held office for life, and could not be removed even by the king. Their decisions in criminal cases were final. Lands were set apart for the maintenance of these judicial officers. They appointed and supervised the actions of the subordinate magistrates, and revised their judgments. In fact, nothing gives a higher idea of the elaborate civilization of Mexico than this judicial system, which culminated in a general court presided over by the king."

"The laws and records of the court were set down in picture-writing."

"The criminal code was very severe. Fraud, the removal of landmarks, and adultery, were punished by having the offender's head crushed between two stones, or cutting out the heart."

DR. TYLOR:

"Below the king was a numerous and powerful class of nobles."

"A rich and powerful merchant class."

"The greatest estates belonged to the king."

"Other classes of slaves were mildly treated, and their children were born free."

"The Supreme Courts of law formed part of the palace, and there were tribunals in the principal cities, over each of which presided a Supreme Judge, who was irremovable and whose criminal decisions not even the king might reverse. He appointed the lower judges and heard appeals from them. Lands were set apart for the maintenance of judges, and, indeed, nothing gives a higher idea of the elaborate civilization of Mexico than this judicial system, which culminated in the general court and council of state, presided over by the king."

"The laws and records of suits were set down in picture-writing."

"The criminal laws were of extreme severity. Fraud, removing landmarks, adultery, etc., which differed as to whether the criminal had his heart cut out on the altar, his head crushed between two stones, etc."

The above are only a few selections. I could go on and make as many more; but any reader who desires to see the deadly parallel for himself,

need only read over the historical part of Mr. Lind's article and then Dr. Tylor's paper in the *Britannica*. How much of an authority Mr. John Lind is on the history of Mexico can now be judged very fairly.

It is bad enough to engage in literary piracy, but to steal what is untrue is many times worse, and unforgivably stupid. Stealing diamonds is bad, but stealing paste diamonds, not knowing that they are paste, must be very unsatisfactory to the thief. That is about the position Mr. Lind is in. Dr. Edward B. Tylor was an Englishman, born in 1832. In 1856, or when he was twenty-four years of age, he went to Cuba, and, having met an ethnologist there, he proceeded to Mexico with him. He became interested in Mexico through that visit, and wrote a book, which he published in 1861. I take this information about Dr. Tylor from the *Britannica's* latest edition. I merely wish the reader to know that Dr. Tylor was only twenty-four years of age when he went to Mexico, and that he lived at a period when he would naturally be influenced by the man who was, at that time, considered the great authority on Spanish-America — Prescott. Since Dr. Tylor's time Mr. Prescott's history, a great part of it, has been relegated by scientific men to where it belongs, to the shelves of delightful romance. Mr. Prescott used the stories of the Spanish conquerors of Mexico, their reports back to the court of Spain, for all they were worth. As romances they were worth a great deal, but as facts they were worth very little. It was Cortez' business to make the Spanish monarchs believe in the wonders of his conquest; and the glowing imagination of some of the people with him helped to do the rest.



Two men have thrown utter discredit upon Prescott's "history" — A. F. Bandelier and Charles F. Lummis. Bandelier devoted his work to the Indians of our own Southwest, Mexico and South America. According to the *Britannica*, Bandelier made himself "the leading authority on the history of Arizona and New Mexico," and, "with F. H. Cushing and his successors, one of the leading authorities on prehistoric civilization." "Bandelier has shown the falsity of various historical myths, notably his conclusions respecting the Inca civilization of Peru." Mr. Bandelier, in a preface to Charles F. Lummis' "*Spanish Pioneers*," stands behind every word that Lummis writes, and Lummis himself has utterly destroyed the romances of Prescott. "That we have not given justice to the Spanish pioneers," says Mr. Bandelier, "is simply because we have been misled. They made a record unparalleled, but our text-books have not recognized that fact, though they no longer dispute it. Now, thanks to the new school of American history, we are coming to the truth, a truth which every manly American will be glad to know. I can only say that the estimates

and statements embodied in this volume are strictly true; and that I hold myself ready to defend them from the standpoint of historical science."

The whole historic section of Mr. Lind's article, following Dr. Tylor's lead, is really an attempt to show how little the Spaniards did and how much of a better civilization they destroyed.

The books of Mr. Lummis on the "Spanish Pioneers" and on "The Awakening of a Nation" (Mexico) are eye-openers to those who desire to know the truth regarding the old civilization and the new. "In spite of our reasonable hostility to the Spanish blood," he says, "we must not give our eyes the lie." "To such as find the testimony of Humboldt inefficient," says Mr. Lummis, "there could be no more useful reading than the laws of Spain as to the Aborigines — the highest-minded, most complete and most noble 'Indian policy' ever framed by man." As an example of the romance in the statements which now pass as history concerning Mexico, both Lummis and Bandelier proved, from fifteen to twenty years ago, that the famous "columns of porphyry and jasper supporting marble balconies," which Dr. Tylor concedes "were piers carrying slabs," to be nothing more than adobe houses like the houses used by our own Pueblo Indians.



But even Prescott did not swallow all the yarns of the Spanish conquerors; but those that he did accept have, nine-tenths of them, gone to the scrap heap. What folly it is at its best, the idea that a people could have been highly civilized who resorted to frightful human sacrifices! Eighty thousand prisoners of war were sacrificed by Montezuma at the dedication of one great temple, "until the gutters ran red with blood."

But Mr. Lind thinks that "the Indian empire of Montezuma, which the Spaniards destroyed four hundred years ago, was in many respects as far advanced as some of the European states at that period. This, of course, is based on Prescott, who thinks that "the degree of civilization which they have reached, as inferred from their political institutions, may be considered, perhaps, not much short of that enjoyed by our Saxon ancestors under Alfred." But it is a long call from Alfred to the days of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Dr. Tylor and Mr. Lind vary from Prescott when they make what the latter calls "itinerant traders," or, in our parlance, "peddlers," "a rich and powerful merchant class." Mr. Lind is evidently unacquainted with either Lummis, Bandelier, Enoch or Hale. Susan Hale's book on Mexico, though biased, yet finds a place in "The Stories of Nations," published by T. Fisher Unwyn of London. The author knew something of recent research. She concedes, with Bandelier and Lummis, that before Cortez, Mexico "was inhabited by intelligent races of men." But she also says:

"Empires and palaces, luxury and splendor, fill the accounts of the Spaniards; and imagination loves to adorn the halls of the Montezumas with the glories of an oriental tale. Later explorers, with the fatal penetration of our time, destroy the splendid vision, reducing the emperor to a chieftain, the glittering retinue to a horde of savages, the magnificent civilization, devoted to art, literature and luxury, reduced to a few handfuls of pitiful Indians, quarreling with one another for supremacy; and sighs to think his sympathies may have been wasted on the sufferings of an Aztec sovereign, dethroned by the invading Spaniard."

Susan Hale's only offered consolation is that "after brushing away the sparkling cobwebs of exaggerated reports, enough fact is left to build up a respectable case for the early races of Mexico," and that is all that can be done to-day.



The truth of the matter is that Spanish civilization in Mexico was to early Aztec civilization as light was to darkness; and all that Mexico possesses to-day of civilization she received absolutely from the Spaniards. "Our partisan histories, even our Encyclopedias," says Lummis, "are either strangely silent or strangely biased. They do not seem to recognize the precedence of Spain, nor the fact that she made in America a record of heroism, of unparalleled exploration and colonization, never approached by any other nation anywhere. Long before the Saxon had raised so much as a hut in the new world, or penetrated a hundred miles from the coast, the Spanish pioneers had explored America from Kansas to Cape Horn, and from sea to sea; and had far inland a chain of Spanish cities five thousand miles long."

How does this accord with the "bondage, the ignorance, the vice and the sloth" of the sixteenth century, according to Mr. Lind? As to the cruelty of Spanish conquests, Mr. Lummis says that "they (the Spaniards) were far less cruel than the Saxon ones." The Spaniard never exterminated. He conquered the Aborigine and then converted and educated him."

I have before me a book by Professor Noll of the University of the South, biased, of course, as most such books are. But the professor is forced to concede this: "It may be frankly admitted that the influence of the religious Orders was, in the main, beneficial to the country throughout the sixteenth century. The archbishops and bishops of Mexico exercised great influence in the affairs of government. They were respected by the civil authorities and venerated by the natives. . . . The Jesuits, who arrived in the year 1572, true to the purposes of their Order, tried to foster learning in the new land, though with but limited

success. Other religious Orders established and maintained admirably appointed hospitals and asylums in every large city."

Enoch, an Englishman, whose prejudices are rather fairly distributed against both Mexico and the United States, frankly says: "The Mexican of to-day owes all he has — law, literature, art and social system, and refinements of law and religion — to Spain."

I believe that any honest student of Mexican history can not but come to exactly the same conclusion; but it is not according to Mr. Lind's policy to say anything good of Spain. She must remain now and forever the oppressor of Mexico, the excuse for revolution, and the horrible example, to show the wisdom of the Lind advice.

MR. LIND'S PERSONAL VIEWS.

The reading of the section of Mr. Lind's article devoted to his personal opinions is interesting, but not informing. He cites, as a horrible example of the oppression of the peon, that "the minimum fee of the Church for marriages, baptisms and ceremonies of the like character is ten pesos. No peon could accumulate or have so much wealth at one time. If he is ambitious to wed his wife in the Church, or to have his first-born baptized, the fee, with the expense of the *fiesta*, makes him a debtor for life."

This can not apply to all peons, for, later on, Mr. Lind says that the northern peon is "able to get married in the Church, have his child baptized, to live in a decent house, and to educate his children; and he does all these things."

Now, if Mr. Lind had taken the trouble to find out the laws of the Church and the customs of Mexico, he would have had an opportunity to qualify his statements. It has, for example, been specifically laid down for the guidance of pastors that they must not demand a fee of any kind from the poor. According to the Church law, there is not a single person in all of Mexico who can not come to his pastor and, if he is poor, have every one of these ceremonies performed without any offering whatever. I, personally, know one pastor in Mexico who annually has had four hundred marriages without offerings of any kind. In other words, the same law applies in Mexico that applies in the United States; and the same understanding of offerings, in connection with such ceremonies, applies in Mexico as applies in the Protestant churches of the United States. There is not a Protestant minister that I know of, or ever heard of, but expects a fee on the occasion of a marriage, and, I believe, also on the occasion of a funeral, if the people receiving his ministrations are able to give it. How grievously the officiating clergyman would be afflicted if he found his envelope empty! Why? Because his fees are recognized as part of his living. It is the same in Mexico. But 10 pesos in Mexico

does not mean \$10 in this country. At present it means \$2, and at the highest rate of exchange it means \$5. The *fiesta* is the father's own business, and the Church has nothing to do with it.

Would \$5 put the average Mexican peon in debt all his lifetime? Mr. Lind surely does not think the American public is so credulous as to believe that. However, that abuses have occurred is very probable; but when they did, those responsible were acting, not in accord with the law of the Church, but in direct contradiction to it.

Then, too, Mr. Lind does not mention the fees of the state. To save the peon from "bondage" to the priest, the state decreed civil marriage. It is true that the fee is only about 50 cents if the marriage is performed in the office of the magistrate. But no Mexican peasant wants that. He wants the marriage at his house, and the state knows this. Then a carriage must be supplied for the magistrate, and two visits made, at a cost of 8 pesos per visit. So 16 pesos is what the civil officials exact for these marriages, which formerly the peon, by simply stating his poverty, could have had performed for nothing.



The conditions under which the Church is supported in Mexico have also been passed over by Mr. Lind. There is no law that compels the peon to give anything to the support of religion. In some places the people voluntarily make offerings of grain, according to the old Spanish law, which, by the way, is also an old French law, and still in vogue in parts of Canada. But in the greater part of Mexico the priests receive no salary and no offerings of any kind, except the voluntary offerings at marriages, baptisms and funerals. Mr. Lind would suppress all this in Mexico, but would not suppress it among his own people in the United States. As a married man, he presumably has made such offerings himself; but, to do away with all chance of the Church existing at all in Mexico, he censures such a practice in the neighboring republic.

Mr. Lind thinks that the Spaniards came to gather wealth and extend the "authority and fanaticism of Spain"; and they did it so well that they imposed that bondage "spiritually and politically." He concedes always that the English colonial policy was harsh and selfish, but was not as bad as the Spanish. He does not mention a great difference, which is that the Spanish bondage preserved the people and the English bondage annihilated them.

But, in spite of all this, Mr. Lind has found great good in the Mexican people. He found them, for example, courteous and kind, grateful, peaceful, patriotic, not ignorant though illiterate, progressive, skilful, not really lazy, with a charming family life, artistic and hospitable. It would be interesting to ask where they got these good traits. Did they persevere

throughout the entire Spanish régime, or have they sprung up since? Historians tell us very plainly that the Spanish régime gave it to them; and, when you come to think it out, it was not such a bad régime that could leave such marks upon a conquered people. If Spain gave the Mexicans only "spiritual bondage and fanaticism," the "spiritual bondage and fanaticism" produced very wonderful results. Would it not, perhaps, be good for us if we had some spiritual bondage and fanaticism of that kind?



Among the "horrors" that the Spanish régime inflicted upon the Mexicans, Mr. Lind mentions the Inquisition. This is rather strange, for other historians tell us that the Inquisition amounted to very little in Mexico. Some of them even hint that it was a method used by the government of keeping order; and, what Mr. Lind does not seem to know, and which I state under the authority of Professor Noll, "the Indians were, by specific command, exempted from its operations."

Of course, Mr. Lind makes an attempt to explain some of the virtues he found in the Mexicans. For example, that of politeness. He charges it to the tyranny of the upper classes, for class distinction, he says, always compels at least outward politeness. Yet, in another part of his article, he informs us that he can not "recall an instance among the thousands of people that I met and came into contact with, or in my walks about the city or on the country roads, where the slightest rudeness or disrespect was shown." Now, class distinctions make for politeness in the oppressed, but not in the tyrant; but Mr. Lind found the politeness in everybody.

It is much to be wondered at where Mr. Lind secured the following bit of information: "One of the first acts of the Spanish conqueror was to distribute the arable lands of the people among his lieutenants and have churches established." The reason I am wondering where he secured this information is because it is not true. The Spaniards distributed the settled lands among the Indians, retaining for themselves the mines and unsettled lands. The land which the Church afterward acquired was received as donations and bequests from individuals, and not from the State. It is very easy for Mr. Lind to verify this, and, in doing so, will find another fly in his peculiar sort of ointment — where he says "a whole nation was made homeless." Natives at any time could take up land in Mexico, and can do so to this day. If Mr. Lind will take the trouble to consult Enoch's book on Mexico, published by T. Fisher Unwyn of London, he will find, on page 157, the following: "National lands have been set aside in vast areas; and any inhabitant of the republic may 'denounce' or acquire a piece of such land, and retain it by paying an annual tax payment, the prices varying from 2 pesos, in the remote regions, to 20 or 30 pesos per hectare, equal to two and one-half acres, in

the more settled states." In some cases this law may have been found worthless, but it is the law.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lind, in speaking of Morelos, speaks to his own discomfiture. He says that there all the land is owned by twenty-seven men. Well, at one time all of this land was parceled out to the people, who proceeded to sell it to the twenty-seven (if that is the correct number of proprietors), and, having sold it and received the money, now they want it again. The question is, will the people remain proprietors when the land is given to them? I have heard prominent and influential Mexicans say that, if the land is again parceled out, there should be a law passed at the same time forbidding the peon to sell.



Here is another statement that manifests either ignorance or a desire to slander. Speaking of the peon's wages, Mr. Lind says: "They are paid twenty-five centavos per day, and given a small measure (about a pint) of corn. They are permitted to keep a few chickens, and occasionally a goat or two; but if they show the least inclination to increase their possessions, their ambition is promptly curbed." As a matter of fact, the peon is given his house, enough land for himself to raise his garden truck, twenty-five centavos in money, and three litres of corn and a half litre of beans. He is not only permitted to keep a *few* chickens, but as many as he wishes; and also a pig. He also receives wood. Besides this, entirely away from his garden, he has another small piece of land, which is for his use; and he may raise, as he does, corn or anything else on it. It must be remembered, too, that the three litres of corn and a half litre of beans, together with the land he has and the wood, he may use as he pleases; and that all his chickens and pigs live on the hacienda. Of course, conditions are not alike all over Mexico, nor can any one exactly define what a "peon" is; but since Mr. Lind offers his statement to cover a general condition, he might as well be truthful.

"The law of Mexico," Mr. Lind says, "makes it a crime for a person in the employ of another to leave service while in debt to the employer. Consequently, the great land owners take care that all their peons are in debt." What are the facts about this? They are that the peon will not enter service without an advanced payment, which is called the "*acomodo*," which amounts to from fifteen to twenty dollars. The land owner is not at all anxious to give this, but the peon insists upon it. That binds him to work for a certain length of time, but as a matter of fact, he works as long as he likes and then he moves. Very seldom is the "*acomodo*" returned to the land owner.



Mr. Lind seems to have very great affection for the Mexican of the North, and he correspondingly despises those of the South. To him the

northern Mexican is the progressive Mexican, and the southern is the one sunk in ignorance and despair. The northern Mexican earns three to four pesos a day in the Texas cotton-fields, on the American railroads and in the mines, so "he has learned to read his own language, and in most cases, has picked up a little English," says Mr. Lind.

This statement is just as untrue as the others. The greatest destitution among the Mexicans is in the North. The loosest morality among Mexicans is in the North. Proof of this Mr. Lind can have by studying the Mexicans in Texas, Arizona and New Mexico, who are all from the North. The most progressive Mexican is in the South. The State of Oaxaca has produced Juarez, Diaz, Pineda, Cervantes, and almost all the governmental brains during the twenty years of Porfirio Diaz. The Oaxaca Indians desire education more than any Indian in the North. The South is the garden spot of Mexico. I wonder if Mr. Lind ever turned his enigmatic face to the South. It is true the Indians in the North have had a better chance — an opportunity to secure better pay, since there is more mining and manufacturing and railroading in the North; there is also better land. But, as a matter of fact, the South is in a much happier condition, and much less prone to revolutionary troubles. No American, who has read reports from Mexico, but knows that the North is the center of revolution, and that the South usually has to be stirred up to join in the blood-letting. A single exception might possibly be the State of Morelos; but it is remarkable, too, as I stated in previous pages, that the revolution in Morelos, under Zapata, showed few of the anti-religious atrocities that accompanied the revolution in the North.

Mr. Lind certainly is optimistic when he states that the northern Indian has learned "to read his own language, and in most cases, has picked up a little English." The truth is that the northern Indian does not want to get an education; and that the southern Indian does. I would ask the reader to remember, in this connection, what I said about Oaxaca. I am not speaking on my own responsibility. I have secured my information from a gentleman who was born in Oaxaca, and who lives in the North, and who was engaged in social work in one of the large cities, but who has had experience in North, South and center. I shall be very glad, indeed, if Mr. Lind is interested, to give my informant's name. He is a Mexican with a European education, and has been a professor in his own country.



Another queer statement of Mr. Lind is that which concerns the operation of the national railroads. He says they were wholly operated by Americans, but that to-day the entire system, from division superintendents to trackmen, is in the hands of peons, who, a generation ago, had not heard steam puff. "They do the engineering, superintend and manage the

shops, construct cars, coaches and locomotives that would do credit to any shop on this side of the line."

It is true, as Mr. Lind says, that "they are not all of the peon class." Neither the engineers, nor the conductors, nor the division superintendents, nor any one else except the laborers, are of the peon class. The fact is that Carranza's experiment was a failure, and that these positions are now open to the Americans, whenever they can get them to come (*vide* the daily papers, which reported about a month ago that the change had been made). The fact is that even when the Mexicans did run the railroads, it was the middle class and not the peon class that did the operating. Mr. Lind fails constantly to distinguish between the two classes.



In the course of his article, the ex-Governor informs us that a Papal bull forbade any instruction in Mexico for two hundred years, except instruction in religion and politeness. Now, Mr. Lind will concede that the Catholic Church is rather a compact organization, and that Papal bulls are usually obeyed by the clergy. Will he kindly explain how it was possible, then, to found the numberless colleges, universities and schools, especially for the Indians, which were established in Mexico by the Spaniards. What Pope issued that bull? What is the date of it? Surely, Mr. Lind knows, and, if he does, he knows more than any authority on Mexico, or any historian of the Church I have ever met.



But the pinnacle of loose statements is reached in the following: "The discipline and restraint shown by the victorious Constitutionalist armies and their chiefs were most creditable and encouraging." I am glad to know what encourages Mr. Lind. He is so quiet-appearing a man, so ministerial-looking, so mild in manner and so silent, that I thought he would be encouraged by the sound of the sickle in the wheat or the hum of industry in the factory, or the scratching of a pen over paper, rather than by the sound of knives cutting throats, guns shooting the innocent, and the thunderous appeals to hatred that came from these victorious armies and their chiefs. Does Mr. Lind think the American people are fools? They know what has happened in Mexico. They know what the "victorious chiefs" have done. They know of the outrages and murders committed. They know that nothing short of the Reign of Terror in France has equaled, for "discipline and restraint," the awful work of his friends in Mexico. This statement from a man who represented the United States, or rather the President of the United States, and must have known everything that went on in Mexico, is one of the most horrible

and blasphemous utterances that I have ever read. It takes the measure at once of John Lind.



Of what use is it to go on further, picking out the things in his article which stamp him as not only incompetent, but absolutely ignorant, after every chance to enlighten himself. If these are the things he told the President of the United States, my contention in previous pages, that the President was deceived, proves to be true. The President must have trusted Mr. Lind. Who would not trust so wise-looking a man? But he trusted him to his own great injury. Mr. Lind was the President's eyes and ears in Mexico, but the eyes saw things that never were, and the ears heard things that are a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. No wonder we are in trouble over our Mexican policy! No wonder that it stands as the one great failure and blot upon a government that meant well, and that intended to do things for Mexico's good. No wonder that it has raised an angry protest among sixteen million people in this country, and is daily bringing to their aid the enlightened among their fellow citizens. If this is what Mr. Lind learned, he had better go to school again. We did not need to send any one to Mexico to get falsehoods. We had access to the Encyclopedia Britannica for the history of Mexico, and we could have copied our impressions out of it just as Mr. Lind did. And as for the things that he reports of his personal knowledge, we have enough lie factories in the United States without paying John Lind to go to Mexico at the expense of the taxpayers and manufacture more lies.

A THIRD PART.

An extra natural division of Mr. Lind's article is his defense of the policy of President Wilson toward Mexico. I am not concerned in attacking President Wilson's policy. I have tried only to give the facts and let people judge for themselves. Moreover, I am in entire sympathy with the President's desire to avoid armed intervention in Mexico. I can go a step farther. I have frequently met and consulted with the archbishops and bishops of Mexico, and I know I speak their minds when I say that *they do not want such intervention*. They are patriotic Mexicans who fear for the independence of their beloved country, who dread the shedding of their countrymen's blood, and who prefer to suffer even death rather than see the foot of an invader step in enmity upon the soil of Mexico. So while as an American I do not want our own country plunged into a war, as the representative of members of the Mexican hierarchy I do not want it for Mexico's sake. What the Mexican bishops want is religious liberty. What American Catholics want is the promise that a government which already has intervened in Mexican affairs to the

extent of telling the Mexican people what they should *not* do, will inform one and all of the factions that the thing they *must* do, if they want recognition by this nation, is to guarantee a true democracy to Mexico, by giving its people what they have not had for fifty years — liberty of conscience.

The President can do that. He ought to do it. He can do no less. We'll forget what is past, but the future, we are determined, shall not be marked by the John Lindisms of the past, by which I mean — the unpardonable blunders of narrow-mindedness and prejudice.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH MEXICO?

Without egotism I think I can answer that question. Every one who knows Mexican history and something of the condition of Mexico to-day, can answer it.

Here is the answer: What is our President's endeavor in his Mexican policy? To his honor and credit, let it be said that he is aiming at giving Mexico a lasting solution for her difficulties in the shape of a pure democracy. But no democracy can be built upon the foundation-stone of tyranny. If the President wishes to solve the Mexican problem, he must begin at the foundation; for all semblance of law has vanished from that country. In the United States we believe that a foundation which does not guarantee rights of conscience is a wrong foundation. Our fathers who founded the republic were a unit on that point. They knew that no State can long survive as a tyranny.

I think it is the general belief of the people of the United States that President Wilson intends to recognize no government in Mexico that he does not believe will give a lasting peace to the country. If he does not secure a pure democracy for Mexico now, whatever government he recognizes must be one in which he has confidence that it will at least prepare the people for it. If his policy aims at makeshifts, we are very much mistaken about it.

In order to get at the crux of the difficulty, it is necessary to know that since 1810 Mexico has been at war, civil or foreign, with but an interval of peace. In the final defeat of the Spaniards with Iturbide, in 1821, the last real stable government left Mexico. Since that time, one revolution has followed another. The dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz was the era of peace. But dissatisfaction was always there. Why?

If Mr. Lind will take a glance at the two great political parties of Mexico, and the two great political parties of the United States, he will see where the difficulty lies, always remembering that Mexican democracy is a conceded failure, while that of the United States is a conceded success.

During the progress of the war between Mexico and the United States, the first active attempt at anti-clericalism was made in Mexico. This

attempt took the form of robbing the Church. I do not defend the condition which made the Church something worth robbing. Personally, I think the Church is better off with little property, outside its religious houses, and its houses for charity and education, than it possibly could be with great wealth. But about robbery, there can be only one opinion.

The wrong method was taken with the Church. Catholics resented it; and out of their resentment on one side, and the desire for spoliation on the other, arose the two great political parties of Mexico — the Clerical and the Liberal. The first was defensive and the other offensive. The Clerical party feared spoliation less than the inevitable result confessed by the Liberals as their goal — the restriction of religious liberty. The events of the last year permit us to verify earlier impressions as to what the Liberals really aimed at. Economic and agrarian questions were only side issues. The great issue of Mexican politics was that of liberty of conscience. Little was said about it, for the Church could say little. She did not want to enter politics. But it is easy to understand other tyrannies with this basic injustice in the laws.

The Mexican people have never been permitted to vote on the question of religious liberty. It was never clearly put up to the suffrage of the nation. Every revolution was an appeal to arms, and not until Madero came was there even a partial attempt to find out the will of the people. Madero proclaimed a free election. The Clerical party was organized with his encouragement, although he was not a member of it. The result of the election, in spite of the fact that the Liberals did the counting of the votes, was really a verdict for religious liberty. Then revolution broke out again. Since in a fair battle of ballots, religious liberty would have won, the ballots were replaced by bullets, and the great question still remains open, and still has in it the certainty of future trouble.



When our own nation was born, its founders settled the question of religious liberty by constitutional enactment. They guaranteed liberty of conscience; and, as a consequence, it was taken out of politics, and every later attempt to make it a part of a political struggle was frowned down upon and defeated by the American people. The parties that fostered such attempts lie wrecked and ruined along the highway of American progress. As a consequence, our political divisions concern themselves about political and industrial questions. They all aim at the material upbuilding of the nation. The foundation-stone of our democracy, in the main, is justice; so we have prospered, and we live at peace with our neighbors.

It is easy, then, to see the radical difference between the Mexican political situation and our own; and it is easy to note the consequence

of each, to put a finger on the canker that is eating the heart out of Mexico, and to know what lies at the root of its political misfortunes. Mexico has a political issue upon which there can be no compromise on the part of the majority of its people. No one can compromise on the question of his natural rights. One may be defeated for the time being, but never conquered. The question of religious liberty is too big for politics. It transcends all other questions — overshadows them, buries them. When men are sincere there can be no other thought on the matter. In Mexico the religious issue is persistent. Fair play can not be secured by arms. The "Liberals" will not yield until the Church is destroyed. They refuse to grant others the rights which they demand for themselves; so all questions which regard the material welfare of the nation are sidetracked. Mexico still suffers as she has suffered for fifty years.

How can the Catholics of Mexico yield? They are not asking for rights which they refuse to grant to their neighbors. Are they wrong in their uncompromising attitude? They have already yielded in every non-essential. They do not ask the return of their old confiscated property. They do not ask a reunion of Church and State. They do not ask for special privileges. They simply ask for the essentials — recognition of their Church's right to exist, to preach, to teach, to administer the Sacraments, and to hold such property as is necessary for the endowment of her charities and her educational establishments. With her it is a fight for life, for liberty to perform her duties. She can not accept laws aimed at these rights, at the sanctity of her priesthood and at her freedom to do acts of charity. Immortal souls are at stake. There is and there can be no further compromise under such conditions.

On the other hand, there is no reason why the Church should be asked to compromise. What she demands is only what our President himself, with his high ideals, would say that a pure democracy gives her a natural right to demand. She has the right to exist. She has the right to minister, and the right to have and to hold what individual free men have consecrated to her service.

For fifty years, upheld by sword and gun, the minority of Mexico has denied the majority its freedom of worship; has interfered with the religious liberty of individuals; has coined their meekness into gold. They have been doing this in the name of "democracy"; so for fifty years there has been no peace in Mexico. Education has been neglected. Agrarian and economic sicknesses have cried out in vain for treatment. Treasuries of successive governments have been looted. Theft has been bold and open; and now comes murder, more robbery, lust and sacrilege. Why? Because fundamentally the whole fabric of Mexican democracy is wrong. It was built on tyranny of the worst kind — tyranny over

men's consciences. The foundation-stone is oppression of the people in the enjoyment of natural rights. You can not tinker with such a structure. You can not improve it so that it will last, unless that false base is pulled out and replaced by justice full and free, by acknowledging the right of the individual to worship God as his conscience tells him to worship Him.

That is the crux of the Mexican difficulty. Here is the thing that needs to be changed. If the United States is to help Mexico to peace and prosperity, the only means the United States has is to point out the fundamental defect; and to insist, now that we have intervened in Mexican affairs, that the cause for future intervention, because of the certainty of future strife in Mexico, must be permanently removed. When the Catholics of the United States ask our Government to refuse recognition to any Mexican government which denies these basic repairs to the Mexican governmental structure, the Catholics of the United States are, at the same time, putting into the President's hands the power to insist upon something which will make his name a future benediction in Mexico; and which will make the American name honored and loved instead of hated and despised, as it is now. Every one in Mexico thinks that we have stirred up religious strife. *The Constitutionlists have killed because they believed the shedding of the blood of priests and nuns would be approved in the United States.* They do not stop to consider that Americans can not approve for Mexico what they hate in their own country.

But is the Church responsible, at least partially, by holding possessions which stirred up the cupidity of men? Even if it were true, that would be no extenuation of robbery. That the victim is rich does not excuse the thief; for the crime does not lie with the robbed, but with the robber. Circumstances may influence the degree of guilt, but not the fact of the crime. Did the Church receive her goods unlawfully? No one claims that she did. The full indictment is that she possessed them. Is that sufficient reason for spoliation? If it is, why do we not enter into a career of spoliation ourselves? Why not rob, as I already pointed out, the endowments of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Creighton, St. Louis, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, and the other universities of this country which are endowed? Their combined endowments must certainly represent more than all the wealth that was ever held for the combined religious, charitable and educational works of the Church of Mexico. Why not rob Mr. Rockefeller, who individually has more money than a biased writer on Mexico, Professor Noll, charges that the whole Catholic Church possessed? But let that point go. It is fifty years since the Church in Mexico has had property. For the last fifty years she practically has had none. The Laws of Reform robbed her. She can not hold property except in the name of individuals, who may turn around and take it from

her. When the Constitutionals charged, as an excuse for their crimes, that the Church had given \$20,000,000 to Huerta, they charged that the Church had given far more money than the combined efforts of all her bishops could have raised in ten years. What wealth she had, at any time, came through the self-sacrifice and labor of thousands of her religious men and women, who took for their part poverty, in order that religion might have the means to teach and minister. Recall to mind the stories told of the fabulous wealth of the Church in the Philippine Islands; yet when the friar lands were purchased by the United States, they were found to be worth only \$7,000,000. That \$7,000,000 represented the savings of ten thousand missionaries, who had nothing for themselves but their food and clothes, and who died penniless through a period of three hundred years. Recently France confiscated the "millions" of the Church. When the spoil was counted up, the government had only \$2,000,000.



Yes, it may be urged, but the Church has spent much money to decorate her shrines. She has silver and gold and precious stones. That is very true, but she can not use such wealth. The silver and gold and the precious stones are the free offerings of the people, who look upon them as the possessions of their own particular towns or villages, and jealously guard them. For example, in Oaxaca there is a shrine rich in pearls. Every pearl came from a pearl fisherman; and these very fishermen themselves to-day have hidden them away, in fear of the spoliation of *their own gifts*. What help is it to the Church of Mexico, in a financial way, that the shrines have been enriched by the people? Why charge the Church with having abundant wealth when she has no more power to touch it than the State has — even less? Some time ago an American millionaire said to me: "Why does not the Church in Milan sell the silver, gold and precious stones around the tomb of St. Charles and use the money for missionary and educational purposes?" I recalled to his remembrance the uniformed government officers standing all around the wonderful cathedral — government guards over wealth that is looked upon as the property of the nation, not of the Church. Thoughtless people affect to be scandalized at the riches of the Church, but in reality the Church owns none of these things. A few years ago it was suggested that the Pope present a work of art from the Vatican galleries to an Emperor. In the Italian Chamber of Deputies the Prime Minister, Crispi, arose and stated that the Pope could do no such thing; that the Church was only the guardian of these works of art; that they really belonged to the nation, and that the nation would take them when she desired a new guardian.



For fifty years the Church in Mexico has been poor, living on the offerings of her people, just as the different Protestant churches in America live on the offerings they receive. Now she is told by the Constitutionalists that she can not longer accept even these little offerings. They proclaim that she must no longer teach or preach, dry the tear of sorrow, bind up the wounds of suffering, protect her orphans, or sooth the pillow of the sick. The men who say this ask our nation to uphold them in their tyranny, ask us to put the stamp of our approval on what we know to be a crime against democracy — and John Lind helps them.

We can have permanent peace in Mexico, but we can not have it on the basis outlined by Mr. Lind. We can have it only on the basis that every thoughtful American knows is the one and only and just basis. The religious issue must be taken out of politics; and then politics will be allowed to work for the industrial upbuilding of the country. I don't care who governs Mexico; the Catholics of the United States don't care; but what we do care about is *how*, whoever governs, will act in this matter of keeping fifteen million unarmed people from their religious and natural rights at the behest of a quarter of a million bandits, with guns supplied by English and American commercial interests, having no thought of any man's rights "so long as *they* can fill their dirty pockets."

The persecutors may buy the silence or encouragement of every paper in the United States as they have already bought plenty of them; they may pull the wool over the eyes of a dozen editors of religious weeklies, as they have already done with some; they may land on every wire that connects with a secret lodge, and drag thousands unknowingly into the evil; they may spend millions to "reach" the officials at Washington and keep them fed on lies; they may play on the political "loyalty" of every office-seeker or officeholder in the nation; they may slander through the pens of a thousand Linds and abuse through the mouths of a million Hales and Sillimans; but — they shall not with the silence of sixteen million Catholic Americans fasten anew on a devoted people the shackles of religious persecution.

The Religious Question in Mexico.

A REPLY TO SEÑOR I. C. ENRIQUEZ

By
FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY.

"So much has been written about the religious difficulties in Mexico, so many groundless accusations against the Constitutionals have been made by the Catholic clergy, that I, as a faithful Catholic and Mexican revolutionist, feel it necessary to answer the numerous charges which are being unjustly heaped upon us. It is a lamentable fact that every one of our accusers, either wilfully or through sheer ignorance, is overlooking the most important laws of the Mexican Constitution. They seem utterly ignorant of the history and the conditions of the country, its people and its aims, about which they are writing. Every one of them is hiding behind the cloak of religious bigotry, and in the name of Christianity and the Catholic religion tries to bring naught but sorrow to a people that is struggling for justice and independence."

The paragraph above quoted contains the opening remarks of Señor I. C. Enriquez in his pamphlet, "The Religious Question in Mexico, by a Mexican Catholic." Readers, however, will have to take the Señor's word for his Catholicity. That is all we have. No stronger evidence is presented in his pamphlet, though there is considerable evidence that he treats his nominal religion with about the same respect as he treats the truth — which is not saying much for either.

Señor Enriquez has taken the trouble to send a copy of his pamphlet to all the members of the Senate and the Congress of the United States, and to give it a wide circulation generally; all of which indicates that his friends are becoming anxious about American public opinion, which is not at all surprising.

The paragraph I have quoted from his opening is remarkable, in that it promises to show that the accusations made against the Mexican revolutionists, not only by American Catholic writers, but also by ex-President Roosevelt, are "groundless and unjust," in that it proposes to prove that these accusers are ignorant of the laws of the Mexican Constitution, and the history and present conditions of Mexico, etc.; and in that it even proposes to vindicate the actions of the Constitutionals. I call such an opening "remarkable," because of the magnitude of

the task to which it pledges its author. Not often does one meet so pretentious a program outlined for a pamphlet of just sixteen pages. My wonder in the beginning at the size of the Señor's bite, was exceeded only by my amusement at the end when I saw that he could not chew it.

The Constitutionalist Apologia, fathered by the Señor Enriquez, is the most wonderful collection of weightless words, proofless assertions, mirthless jokes, and profitless falsehoods with which I have had the misfortune to lose my time for many, many moons. The Señor's task is preëminently one of excusing crime, for he does not take the trouble to offer any proof that the outrages of murder, sacrilege, arson, lust, destruction, suppression of the press, robberies, lootings, etc., did not take place. He *says* they did not, and that is all. Then he at once proceeds to admit that they did, by attempting to excuse them. If they did *not* take place, why devote sixteen pages to the unnecessary task of an apology? If they *did* take place, would it be possible with all the water in the Atlantic Ocean, or all the lies of the Constitutionalist lie factories, to blot them out?

Since, however, the Señor insists on getting before the American public, perhaps I had better gratify him still more by making his name and his task known to a much larger audience. I am led to do this, not only for the sake of publishing the truth in the United States, but also for a reason that concerns the Señor and his friends. They have been grossly deceived about the American people. They were told that Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan were bigots "who would be pleased with anything done against the Catholic Church." They were told that the Protestants of the United States would be delighted with any act of the Constitutionalists to injure and hurt the same Church. They believed the numerous lying papers, tracts and booklets, translated into Spanish, and scattered among them to give them the idea that the Protestants of the United States had a mortal hatred for their Catholic brethren. They thought that Catholics here had no standing, no rights that they would dare to claim, no voice that could be heard; and they even suspected that Catholic votes did not count. Now they have had their eyes open. I want to open them still wider. They have discovered that American Protestants, outside of a few bigots whose convictions are like their spelling — badly mixed — at heart desire to be just and honest men and women. They have begun to suspect that neither the President nor the Secretary of State has been correctly pictured to them. They have found that, when the just indignation of American Catholics is aroused, it means business. They have even discovered that Masons in the United States and Masons in Mexico think differently. So, at this late hour, they come forward as "Mexican Catholics" to praise the "poor priests" of Mexico, to hail them as "liberators"; but making "saving" distinctions, they attempt to

throw blame upon the "high orders" of clergy, implying that these are foreigners, wealthy, rapacious, unpatriotic and cruel. With praises for some priests and curses for others, they would have the American Catholic forget that their pens, dipped in falsehood, have handles stained red with the blood on their fingers.

But that will not do, Señor; it will not do at all. We know the story of Mexico. We know what has been done there for over fifty years. We never knew it before. It took martyrs' blood to call our attention to it, and the martyr's blood has not been shed in vain. There are sixteen million Catholics in the United States; and to the last man, woman and child, they have learned or will learn the history of Constitutionalist crimes. They are going to see that justice is done the poor people of Mexico. They are not going to falter in the fight. They will see it through. Make no mistake—they are aroused as never before. You will have religious liberty in Mexico, or there will be a reckoning; and a reckoning that will not end until the sum is totaled up, and put to the discredit, in the books of civilization, of the proper account. It will pay you and your friends, Señor, to weigh carefully what follows.

Your charges, the charges of a "faithful Mexican Catholic," as expressed in your pamphlet, may be summed up thus:

First.—That the accusations made against those whom you represent are false.

Second.—That the higher clergy of Mexico are the enemies of the people, are robbing them and standing out against their political rights, by intrigue and scheming.

Third.—That these same higher clergy ignore and disobey your laws.

Let us see how much truth there is in what you have to say.

ENRIQUEZ.—*"It is a lamentable fact that every one of our accusers, either wilfully or through sheer ignorance, is overlooking the most important laws of the Mexican Constitution."*

Answer.—Your accusers have overlooked no laws in the Mexican Constitution. On the contrary, they have constantly pointed out the kind of laws which Revolutionists have put upon the statute books of a Republic masquerading under the name of a democracy. The demand of American Catholics is based upon a *knowledge of these laws*, which are subversive of the basic principles of democracy, are tyrannical and strike at the very root of the rights which are supposed to be guaranteed by the Mexican Constitution, liberty of conscience. Here is a summary of the Laws of Reform, which I have already published in *THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW*, page 57:

"When the Revolution came, and with it the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez, an end came also to what little freedom the Church had. She was despoiled of such possessions as had been left her. She was forbidden to teach, which means to open schools of any kind, except of theology. Her ministers even could not dress as clerics. The law of May 13, 1873, forbade any religious demonstration outside of a church building, and forbade clergymen or Sisters to dress in any way that would indicate their calling. The Constitution of 1857 interfered with personal liberty to the extent of forbidding anybody to enter a religious Order, and refused religious Orders a legal right to hold property. The law of July 12, 1859, suppressed religious Orders and religious societies, forbade the foundation of new congregations, ordered all books, manuscripts, prints and antiquities belonging to such Orders to be given up. The law of February 26 suppressed female communities. The law of July 12, 1859, took away all property from the clergy; but that of February 5, 1861, returned to the Church its parochial residences, bishops' houses, etc. Then September 25, 1873, saw a new law which forbade any religious institution to acquire property or the revenue derived from it. The law of December 14, 1874, struck at the right of the clergy to receive legacies. The law of July 31, 1859, took away from the clergy the right to manage or have anything to do with cemeteries. The law of February 2, 1861, took from the Church her hospitals and charitable institutions, as also did a law of February 28 of the same year. To make it more certain that the Church could not be charitable, the law of August 27, 1904, forbade clergymen to act as directors and administrators, or patrons of private charities, and extended this decree even to include those delegated by clergymen. It will clearly be seen that, under the Constitution and Laws of Reform, the clergy had little power left, and the Church little chance to uplift the people."

These are the laws of Mexico which Mr. Enriquez says we have ignored. How do American citizens like them? How would they enjoy having such laws put in force against religion in the United States? And these are the very laws, Mr. Enriquez informs us later on in his pamphlet, that the Carranzistas want enforced to the letter. Are these the things that are going to bring happiness "to a people that is struggling for justice and independence"?

ENRIQUEZ.—*Who is this man, who, for fear of divulging his name, signs himself "An American Citizen"? Why does he fear to make his name known? Is it because he had the audacity to attack President Wilson's policies, etc.?*

Answer.—I can not tell Mr. Enriquez who the gentleman is, or why

he did not sign his name; but I am signing *my name*. I can assure Mr. Enriquez that I do it with a full knowledge of the fact that the only answer thus far made to people who happened to disagree with the Constitutionalists, was a shower of bullets from a firing squad. Happily for me I am not in "Constitutionalist" territory; but I am not ignoring the risks. Here, however, assassination is dangerous. I beg to state also that I am making no attack on President Wilson's policies; but I *am* making an attack on looters and bandits, who, in the name of liberty and justice, have strangled every bit of freedom that exists in Mexico, and who know no more about justice than the ordinary mad dog.

ENRIQUEZ.—*Every one who knows anything at all is aware of the fact that Masonry in Mexico is nothing more than a huge joke.*

Answer.—For which statement, Masons will be thankful to Mr. Enriquez. How about the bold demand made on the American Government by the Mexican Scottish Rite, to instantly evacuate Vera Cruz?

And what about the following press sheet, dated February 8, 1915, sent out by the Mexican Constitutionalist Bureau, located in Suite 334, No. 17 Battery place, New York?

"The Name of Huerta Crossed Out from the Books of Freemasonry."
From *El Pueblo*, Vera Cruz, December 11, 1914.

"He is considered unworthy of belonging to that league because he betrayed the Mexican people and allied himself with the clergy.

"Victoriano Huerta, the accursed Judas, who, during many months, soiled the national territory with the most opprobrious dictatorship, and whose crimes without number have had no precedent in the history of our country, has just been crossed out of the Big Catalogue of Freemasonry, under the grave accusation and indictment of having betrayed the Mexican people.

"The respectable Concordia Lodge, of the town of Jalapa, was the one who initiated this just expulsion, as will be seen by the following document:

"To the Resp.: Gr.: Log.: United Mexican and Free Accepted Masons of the Or.: of Vera Cruz.

"M.: R.: M.: and VV.: HH.:

"In an ordinary session, held on the 24th inst., this respectable, worthy and courageous lodge arrived at the following agreement:

"There having been found in the files of this respectable Lodge a Letter Patent issued by the Grand Lodge of the State of Vera Cruz of

Free and Accepted Masons R.: E.: A.: and A.: under date of the 24th of ——— 1883, so that under No. 4 it should be effective in this Lodge, Concordia No. 17, in this Or.: of Vera Cruz, and where is inscribed as Venerable Master of same the M.: M.: Victoriano Huerta, the Grand Master informed the members and they unanimously agreed to cross out with red ink the name of the bad Mason, Victoriano Huerta, as unworthy of having his name appear in the Masonic Documents, and because of the understanding and alliance he made with the Catholic Clergy, and also for having betrayed the Mexican people. They also agreed to inform the Grand Lodge of Vera Cruz of this decision, requesting it to make it known to all the grand lodges and regular corporations in the Republic, as well as to all the foreign corporations with whom you are on friendly terms.

“ ‘In favoring us with information, in the understanding that the laws of the fraternity should be unconditionally obeyed, crossing forever out of the Big Catalogue of Freemasonry, the ex-Mason Victoriano Huerta, we feel sure that all our brothers will approve the inflexibility we have brought to bear in this case, with the idea of preserving the soundness of the order and purity of Freemasonry.’ ”

The Grand Master:

MARCELINO SANCHEZ.

The Secretary:

N. NEVRAMONT.

From this it appears that General Huerta was guilty of two capital crimes: One, the first and most important, of having been a Catholic, which every one knows is what is meant by an “alliance with the Catholic clergy”; the other, secondary, of “having betrayed the Mexican people.” To the eyes of Latin Masonry the first is the “crime” most deserving of punishment — the unforgivable sin.

If “every one who knows anything at all is aware of the fact that Masonry in Mexico is nothing more than a huge joke,” why pass the action of the “huge joke” on to the press of the United States, as something of such great importance to the Constitutionalist cause, as to justify a prayer to all American editors, to “kindly use this matter in the bulletin as liberally as your space will permit”? And why, if Mexican Masonry does not concern itself with religion and politics, as others would have us believe, should General Huerta be expelled for an “alliance he made with the Catholic Clergy”? It will enlighten the members of the craft in these United States, in England, Canada and the British Islands, who still believe in God and religion, to know that the Catholic Church has here the unmistakable proof of what it has long pointed out

to them, the fact that Latin-Masonry looks upon "alliance with the Catholic Clergy," as full justification for expulsion and hatred, and worthy of approval as "preserving the soundness of the order and purity of Freemasonry."

*"I thank thee, Roderic, for the word";
It nerves my heart; it steels my" — pen,*

but the religious Masons of English-speaking nations will "*thank thee*" more, and see still greater wisdom of the policy they claim to have adopted of not being on "friendly terms" with Latin-Masons.

ENRIQUEZ.—*If the men who plead the cause of the oppressed Mexican Clergy are to be taken at their word, it would seem that the whole Mexican nation is composed of inconsiderate brutes and beasts.*

Answer.—The overwhelming majority of the Mexican nation is composed of good, pious and peaceful people, out of whose hands a minority of "inconsiderate brutes and beasts" have taken all arms, all money, a free press, the right to vote, the right to talk, the right to practice their religion; in fact, all rights to which any free people are entitled.

ENRIQUEZ.—*They would like to create the impression that murder and rapine are rampant in that country, and that the main attacks are directed against the Catholic Clergy.*

Answer.—It seems that it has been easy to create the impression. On page 10 of THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW, and following for a number of pages, is the whole story, giving dates, names of cities, names of persons, in fact, the fullest information that can be squeezed within the pages of a pamphlet for general circulation. *If the statements are "ridiculous," why not answer them?* The Constitutionlists are on trial before the court of American public opinion, for they are asking the United States to recognize them as the legitimate rulers of Mexico. They must bring before the court something more than mere statements. The evidence is in on the one side, and Señor Enriquez in his rebuttal presents none. There are lawyers enough in the Senate and Congress of the United States to know how to treat a case unsupported by evidence.

ENRIQUEZ.—*The first thing our soldiers did when we entered a city was to seek out the houses of worship and offer our prayers in thanks to Him Who brought us victory.*

Answer.—Undoubtedly, there is a grain of humor in the Señor Enriquez. However, he is right in part, for certainly *his friends did go to the churches!* When they got there they shot at the statues; stole the

pictures and sent them to America for sale; desecrated the sanctuaries; expelled such priests as had no money; took out the confessionals and burned them in the public squares; fed the Blessed Sacrament to horses; did unmentionably vile things with the sacred vessels; used the vestments for horse blankets; and then, in order to make sure that their "thanks" would be properly offered to the God Who "gave them victory," *shot some of the priests*. Yes, there is no doubt that the Señor Enriquez is right: "*The first thing they did was to go to the houses of worship.*"

ENRIQUEZ.—*To understand the true causes and reasons of dissension and strife between the people and certain members of the High Catholic Clergy, one must go back to the first struggles of Mexico against the Spanish domination. It is the same struggle.*

Answer.—It is the same struggle? Yet for over fifty years the Spaniards have been out of Mexico. The Church has had no legal existence in Mexico. There has been no union of Church and State in Mexico. Clergymen have been forbidden by law even to wear a clerical collar on the streets of Mexico. Bishops have been arrested for blessing a cemetery in Mexico, even for attempting to lay a cornerstone; for presiding over a gathering of children at Christmas time to make presents to the little ones of Mexico. The Church has not been allowed to receive a bequest in Mexico. She has not been allowed to hold property in her own name in Mexico. Inheritance taxes aimed at her confiscate any property she may have in the names of private individuals, by three transfers in Mexico. Yet it is the same struggle? For over fifty years, the Church has been bound hand and foot; and the Constitutionals assert that, shackled and manacled, she still is such a power that a new revolution is necessary to prevent her from cutting liberty's throat. This is one of the mirthless jokes of the Señor Enriquez.

ENRIQUEZ.—*The rulers of Spain left, but many of their harmful institutions stayed behind, and it is these institutions, which have been slowly devouring the minds of the Mexican people, which usurped all their rights, and keep them in ignorance, that we Mexicans are still fighting and struggling against.*

Answer.—In order to struggle intelligently against these institutions left by the Spaniards, you close schools, destroy colleges, loot laboratories, scatter manuscripts to the four winds of heaven, sell valuable books and typewriters for a few cents, and throw thousands of Mexican children out of the one chance they had to get an education. Our plan in the United States is to encourage every means of educating the people. The

Mexican Constitutionalist plan is to discourage it. Spanish institutions? Enoch, an English Protestant, says: "The Mexican of to-day owes all he has — law, literature, art and social system, and refinements of law and religion — to Spain."

ENRIQUEZ.—*To say that we are nothing short of murderers, that we wantonly persecute the priests and the nuns; is to slander the Mexican nation.*

Answer.—Pardon me, let us make a distinction. To say that the Carranzista bandits wantonly persecuted the priests and nuns, is not indicting the Mexican nation; for there are sixteen million people in Mexico who want peace and order, law and religion, and there are not more than two hundred thousand who have been deceived by the self-seekers who hired blinded fools to kill, and paid them with liberty to commit every lustful crime in the calendar. Why are the poor women of Torreon wearing black?

ENRIQUEZ.—*Does any one believe that a nation which attained its freedom by the aid of its priests, would, a few years later, turn against them?*

Answer.—They have not turned against them. On the contrary, the people want them. See in THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW the Story of Yucatan, page 44, and the pitiful appeal made to the Carranzista governor by the women of the State, not to expel their priests. What about the rising of the people in Morelia? (vide page 54).

ENRIQUEZ.—*But the priests who fought for the liberty of the Mexican peons are not the high Church dignitaries of to-day.*

Answer.—This is to intimate, of course, that the high Church dignitaries of to-day are Spaniards; *but there is not a single Spaniard holding a Bishop's See in Mexico.* Every single bishop in Mexico is a Mexican. Every one of them is a patriotic Mexican; but they have what may be considered a weakness in the Señor Enriquez's eyes — a love for law and order. They want a country, not a slaughter-house. They prefer ballots to bullets. They want liberty of conscience and freedom of worship, and a chance to educate their people; all of which has been denied for over fifty years.

ENRIQUEZ.—*Those who failed to obey, or showed the least sign of disobedience, were punished, with the well-known Spanish Inquisition, the tortures of hell.*

Answer.—Strange statement from one who reproaches us with ignorance of Mexico's history. The Mexicans were, by special royal

decree, exempt from the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, which was a state institution in Mexico, as it was in Spain.

ENRIQUEZ.—*By such means (land grants, inheritances, etc.), the Church and certain high dignitaries of the Church, became the Supreme Power of Mexico.*

Answer.—If that is true, why was it that Bishop Las Casas had to fight the State in order to secure the rights of the Indians? Why was the Church obliged to constantly barter with Spain for the liberties of the natives?

ENRIQUEZ.—*It was to these poor native priests that the oppressed and down-trodden Mexicans went in time of dire need.*

Answer.—Among the hundreds of exiles here and in Cuba, two-thirds are the same poor priests, some Indian priests. We had to find bread for them to eat and clothes to wear. I know how much wealth they possessed, for I saw and spoke to them. Señor Enriquez prints a letter which, he says, was written by the Archbishop of Mexico. That letter states that the salary of the Archbishop, himself, was 750 pesos a month, which means \$325 in our money. With that he had to maintain his entire establishment. Now, the Archbishop of Mexico is the highest dignitary in the Mexican Church; so for the food, clothing, servants, household expenses and charities of the highest of the high Catholic Clergy there was \$325 a month. By the way, did the Señor Enriquez ever hold a public office in Mexico? If he did, how much salary did he get? According to the same letter, Canons of the Cathedral of Mexico received 120 pesos a month, which is \$60 of our money. The choir chaplains got from thirty to forty dollars, which is *from fifteen to twenty dollars a month* in our money. These “high clergy” in Mexico certainly are living in luxury and robbing the people. If an average were struck of the gifts to the Church by the Mexican peon, it would show *less than twenty cents per capita per year*. This is fine robbery.

ENRIQUEZ.—(*Quoting from another*) “*Indeed, a careful estimate of the revenue of the Church, just previous to the War of Independence, reveals the enormous figure of \$50,000,000 a year.*”

Answer.—Yet Professor Noll, very prejudiced and anti-Catholic, estimates it about \$90,000,000 *in capital*. There is a big difference between a *capital* of ninety million and a *revenue* of fifty million annually. In order to get this properly before people who think, let them estimate the revenue of, say, the Episcopal Church in the United States. Make as conservative an estimate as you please of the revenue of its missionary societies — home, foreign and diocesan — its schools, colleges, universi-

ties, churches, pension funds, endowments of all kinds. Then stir in the fact that there are about fifteen million Mexican Catholics, to less than one million American Episcopalians, and serve hot.

Is it a horrible crime for a clergyman to seek the means of livelihood? Why not condemn the twelve Apostles? As long as there is a dollar not yet sent to the banks of El Paso, San Antonio, New York and Paris, against the great day of the exodus, the Constitutionals have a bone to pick with the clergy. But are the clergy of Mexico rich? I happen to know that the Constitutionals secured the private papers of the bishops, copies of their last wills and testaments, the diocesan records of each, and the Chancery ledgers. They must know, then, all about the wealth of the clergy of Mexico. Then, why content themselves with assertions when it would be so easy to publish the facts and proofs? "There's a reason." The books and records will not bear out the Constitutionalist assertions.

ENRIQUEZ.—*The Church had become such a powerful force in the political life, due to its enormous possessions, that it could change the government any time it wished to do so.*

Answer.—How? By votes? If the high Church dignitaries could change the government any time they wished to do so in that way, the people could not have been against them. As Mexican citizens, the high Church dignitaries would have had the right to take the same interest in politics that any other citizen takes; and it is up to the people to judge. If they judged that it was time to change a government, is not that within their democratic rights? Where is your complaint? As a matter of fact, however, since there were no such things as honest elections, by what other means could the bishops change the government? By revolutions? When did they rebel? Who led the revolutions? Who supplied the money? Hand us out the facts; that's what we are after. Or, if these high Church dignitaries could change the government when they wished, inform us why they did not change the Laws of Reform. Would they have kept these oppressive laws over themselves for fifty years, when they could have changed them by the simple operation of changing the government? Is your humor again getting the better of you, *mi estimable Señor?*

ENRIQUEZ.—*The Revolutionists devoted much of the new Constitution to the elimination and the divorce of the Church from the State.*

Answer.—Let me see, did not the Señor say that the present Revolution of Carranza is the "same struggle" as that of the Revolution against

Spain; and that the Constitutionalists are trying to separate Church and State *now*? But they were separated years ago. Vat iss?

ENRIQUEZ.—*Of late much has been written about the ignorance and immorality prevalent among the poor classes of the Mexican populace. It is said that a large majority of them totally disregard the marriage ceremony and live in open violation of the sacraments of marriage . . . An investigation has proven that the price for marriage sacraments, instituted by the high Catholic Clergy, is so unreasonably high, that it is almost impossible for the poor to meet it.*

The answer to part of this statement comes from a most unexpected source. I take the following from the editorial columns of *The Churchman* (Protestant Episcopal), of February 6, 1915:

“Mr. William Watson, who has lived for nearly eight years in Mexico in some of its best-known centers of population, uses vigorous language in criticising the statements regarding the religious condition of Mexico that appear in the American press. He does not agree with those who ascribe the present revolution to religious causes. While the uprising is supposedly conducted for the benefit of the unpropertied class, the *peon*, it seems strange, he says, that their churches suffer just as much from robbery and outrage as the churches of the rich. Dealing with the question of ecclesiastical fees, Mr. Watson finds much exaggeration in recent reports. In the places where he has lived, Puebla, Oaxaca, Guadalajara and Mexico City, baptisms cost from 33 cents to 69 cents; it has been asserted that they cost \$5. Marriage fees are from \$2.50 to \$3; requiems cost 50 cents; special prayers, 5 cents; confirmation, 15 cents; confessions and communions cost nothing. ‘Once a year in all these places mission priests go around holding missions. During the missions baptisms and marriages are gratis, although sometimes 50 centavos is asked for a marriage during a mission.’ When it is also taken into consideration that the Roman Church has no ‘envelope system’ for its support, but depends upon these methods for collecting from the poor people, it will be seen that the *peon* contributes but little to the support of the Church, a fact patent to all who visit their little shrines and see their priests. The Roman Church has also a practice of asking for *Diezmos*, or the Jewish tenth. But this does not touch the *peon*, who has no land or money. The *Diezmo* is given on New Year’s Eve. People with money are always charged according to their ability to pay. It is commonly reported that the Roman Church is responsible for the ignorance of the people. This is not true, either. In Mexico City there are many fine schools controlled by the Church, and there are not more than three or four decent buildings built by the State for school purposes. The Church has schools because

the public schools do not begin to make provision for the children. Over fifty years ago, Juarez robbed the Church of their all in order to benefit the people, just as the present warring factions are doing. And just as the *peons* did not benefit by the Juarez theft, neither will they benefit by it now. Let us be honest about the Roman Church, even if we do not love it."

Mr. Watson is certainly honest about the Church that he does not love. I would change only a word of his letter — the word "*cost*." There is no "*cost*." The Church permits *offerings* on the occasion of marriages, baptisms, etc. "*Cost*" implies that a price is put on a spiritual benefit. As a matter of fact, the offering is not required from those who state that they are unable to make it. In many parts of Latin-America the clergy have no other means of support apart from these offerings. An offering is not even *permitted* on the occasion of confession.

As to the assertion that many Mexican men and women live together, without the marriage ceremony; I do not doubt but that Mexico has its share of immorality. That is not to be wondered at, since the State has been striving for half a century to break down the religious life of the people. What is to be wondered at is the Carranza remedy. That remedy is outlined in a decree published by the "First Chief," quite recently. His plan to prevent the lower classes of Mexicans from living in open violation of the sacrament of marriage, is *to legalize this sort of prostitution by allowing divorce by mutual consent*. He figures, I suppose, that there will be a great many more ceremonies, every couple contributing from ten to fifty during a lifetime; since, each three years, the decree permits the married pair to separate and each to select a new consort. Now, in Mexico, as is explained in THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW, people like to have the marriage ceremony at their houses. That costs sixteen pesos, plus the price of the two carriage trips to bring the civil official to the two ceremonies. The Church expects an offering from those who are able to give it, but nothing from the poor. The civil official must have his carriages and fees. The Constitutionalist remedy will be a fine thing for the civil officials, since the Church is not to be permitted to solemnize marriages. All fees are to be thrown into the hands of the officers of the State. This is a method of increasing the revenue of office-holders, which possibly did not occur to our own politicians. Surely, Señor Carranza deserves credit for pointing out a chance we overlooked.

ENRIQUEZ.—*But the greatest tragedy of the Catholic Church in Mexico is that it is a house very much divided against itself. It possesses no unity of purpose; it has no honest desire to uplift, to educate and alleviate the needs and sorrows of the masses.*

Answer.—This will certainly be news to the great number of intelligent Americans, who think that the Catholic Church has a considerable unity of purpose and is anything but divided against itself. In fact, it is one institution in the world which is known to have the strongest unity of purpose, and which will tolerate no serious division within. However, it would be rather hard for the Church to possess any more than an "*honest desire* to educate and alleviate the needs and sorrows of the masses" in Mexico, because if it tried to carry such an *honest desire* into *practice*, it would find that, in the eyes of the Mexican laws, it does not exist; that it can not build a hospital, a school, an orphanage, a social center, or even a lazaretto, because it has no right under the law to do so. It has no legal right to be charitable, to teach, to nurse the sick, to help the down-trodden, or even to dry the tear of sorrow. When it attempts these things, it has to do them *against the laws*, as Mr. Enriquez acknowledges. In the beginning of his pamphlet, Mr. Enriquez complains that the Church has thus violated the law. Now, he complains that she won't violate it. What does he really want the Church to do?

ENRIQUEZ.—*The true condition of the Catholic Church is that it is composed of wealthy, foreign, high clergymen and of poor priests who are native Mexicans and Indians.*

Answer.—Who are the high dignitaries of the Church of Mexico? First, Archbishops — but all are Mexicans; second, Bishops — all Mexicans; third, Vicar-Generals — all Mexicans; fourth, Canons — nine-tenths Mexicans. (I do not know of a single foreigner among the Canons.) These are the dignitaries. Now who are the lesser clergymen? Parish priests of the cities — nine-tenths Mexicans; country pastors — nine-tenths Mexicans; assistant priests — nearly all Mexicans, *but with a good percentage of Spaniards*. Mark you, the largest percentage of foreign clergy is found among the *assistants*. But where there are many Spanish pastors, as in sections of Yucatan, they are there only because they had to be called in as helpers. There was a scarcity of native priests. That is why, too, there are Spaniards among the religious Orders of teachers. It is the policy of the Church in Mexico, as in every country, to secure a native clergy.

ENRIQUEZ.—*They (the clergy) intrigue, they scheme. They are the friends of the reactionary forces; they kow-towed with Diaz when he was in power and used Huerta and his henchman, Dr. Urrutia, when they reigned supreme.*

Answer.—And yet Diaz promulgated some of the laws which the "patriotic" Constitutionalists love, because these laws oppressed the Church; and Huerta, though he was only a short time President, left one

as a souvenir of his dictatorship. Does it ever occur to Señor Enriquez that the laws of the Church require Catholics to obey the civil power and respect the civil authority? By what right would the Church or its "high dignitaries" take it upon themselves to decide that they should disobey a President accepted by the people? Diaz was President, recognized by Mexico, recognized by the United States, recognized by every government in the world. Huerta was President of Mexico, recognized by other governments, though not by the United States; but he succeeded to power in obedience to all the forms of Mexican law. If the Church had rebelled against him, we would have had Señor Enriquez and others of his kind pointing out this fact with great triumph. The Church did not rebel. The Church was peaceful and accepted the government that was over its people, as it always does. *Now, it is charged with treason because it did the one thing that it could do without becoming treasonable.* Again I ask what does Señor Enriquez want the Church to do?

As to scheming, what was the Church scheming about? To change the laws so as to give her some liberty? She could claim a right to do that under a democracy. Does the gentleman forget that Mexico was pretending to be a democracy?

ENRIQUEZ.—*In fact, they were the enemies, for they always upheld the benighted forces of Mexico.*

Answer.—Who were these benighted forces? Everybody who disagreed with the Constitutionals? Everybody who thought that a pure democracy ought to grant liberty of worship, freedom of education, and the common ordinary natural rights of citizenship? The trouble is that Señor Enriquez and his kind have settled in their own minds what *they want*; and, looking back over the history of Mexico, they coolly dub as traitors everybody who even suggested that what *they want* was not the *best thing* for the country. A democracy is "of the people, for the people and by the people." But in Mexico any one who holds contrary opinions to the small circle of revolutionary "patriots" must be considered as having no rights which their opponents are obliged to respect. This is why Mexico settles her troubles with bullets instead of ballots. Verily, the path of the politician in Mexico is strewn with thorns, and there is danger in his ways.

ENRIQUEZ.—*The shameless manner in which the high Catholic clergy forsook their religious offices and dabbled in politics is illustrated by the numerous letters which were left behind by Dr. Aureliano Urrutia, Minister of Interior in the Huerta cabinet.*

Answer.—Señor Enriquez has added six letters to prove this assertion—six *specially selected*. We commend a study of these letters to every one interested.

The first was written by Archbishop Gillow, evidently a personal friend of the Minister, for he addresses him: "Esteemed Sir and Friend." He speaks of certain disturbers who were molesting the authorities, and interfering with public peace. He commends one of the governors, who worked for the well-being of his district. He speaks of false accusations being made by disturbers against this governor. He commends a Judge of the Primary Court of Claims, who is trying to do his duty. He offers his letter for the purpose, as he says, of maintaining "order and peace in this district," and he thanks the Minister in advance for whatever he may deem fit to do in the interests of honest citizens.

This certainly is an "incriminating" letter, and clearly proves that the Archbishop was interested in peace and order; therefore, a splendid example of a "traitor" according to Constitutionalist ideas of what a traitor is.

The next letter is from the Archbishop of Mexico City to the same Minister. It sets forth, that under the "beneficent" laws of Mexico, he was robbed of his home, which was taken over for governmental offices. He asks that it be restored to him. He suggests that some restitution might be made also for the cash, sacred vases, such as chalices, shrines, lamps, articles of silver, jewels, all stolen from the Cathedral; also for the Seminary building next door, which was likewise taken, and for the houses of his chaplains. He speaks of the poor financial condition of his diocese as a consequence of this robbery; and he asks for restitution *at least in part*. Señor Enriquez calls these "alleged damages." So it is not a sin to steal from an Archbishop. Mexican "professionals" will take note how they may steal without danger.

This Archbishop is a horrible example of a "traitor"; the man actually wants to get back the things he was robbed of. But there is a mitigating circumstance in his favor; he is not a *full* traitor because he would be satisfied with a *part* restitution.

The third letter is from the Archbishop of Puebla. I do not know what it is about, because, as a matter of fact, it does not say anything.

The fourth is from Archbishop Gillow again. It refers to the fact that the Archbishop, with a lawyer and an engineer, had been appointed by General Diaz "to study and report" on some proposed concessions for an international and interoceanic railway. It appears that the Archbishop did not agree with his colleagues, because he did not want to have the

State give up so much money to the concessionaries. He urges that time has proven the correctness of his ideas, and points out two lines, which, in his opinion, are of greater importance to Mexico. He urges the necessity of completing, as soon as possible, the railroad from Mexico to Tehuantepec, via Puebla and Oaxaca. He mentions that the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, using Baron Humboldt's expression, is the "bridge of the universe," etc. He speaks of the great importance of such a line to his own State of Oaxaca, and says that he is interested in its construction for the advantage of the people of his diocese. He speaks also of his knowledge of the State and of its riches and possibilities. Practically that is his whole letter.

Another clear proof of "treason." This man was interested in his State, and in the Republic of Mexico. He refused to vote an enormous sum for unnecessary railroad concessions; but points out where, in his opinion, the necessity does exist. That he has a right to do so, and that he was a man whose opinion was worth while, is proven by the fact that the President had appointed him to such an important commission. He places his knowledge at the disposal of the Minister of the Interior, asks for nothing, but points out what he thinks would result in national benefits. I wonder if Senators and Congressmen of the United States could not, each of them, gather up a large series of "incriminating" letters of this kind against "traitors," clergymen of all denominations, in Podunk, Blue Ridge, Pine Grove, and to the uttermost ends of the Republic, pointing out, not benefits such as those which would result in a railroad over the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, but benefits in dredging a mud creek. If Señor Enriquez had only known something about American politics, he would not have been trapped into publishing a letter of this kind as a proof of "treason." Why, bless your heart, my dear Señor, letters endorsing even applicants for postoffices are considered as the outpourings of patriots, and clergymen write them every day.

The fifth letter is from the Minister to the Archbishop. He acknowledges having received the suggestion and of having considered it. He believes that such a railroad is of great importance, not only from the military point of view, but for the convenience of the public in general. He promises to take an interest in it when circumstances permit.

There is no doubt that such a letter as this, coming from the Minister of the Interior, should be punished with death. I shall always, in the future, with Señor Enriquez's standards of patriotism before me, look with grave suspicion upon any Cabinet officer of the United States, who ventures to suggest any improvement of any kind whatever, or to take

an interest in any public work that might possibly be of advantage to the people.

The sixth and last letter is supposed to be from the Archbishop of Michoacan to the same Minister. It is unnecessary for me to quote from the letter, because I am acquainted with the real Archbishop of Michoacan. This letter is dated September 11, 1913, and is signed "Jenaro Mendez." It happens that the Archbishop of Michoacan's name is not Jenaro Mendez, but Leopoldo Ruiz. It is up to Mr. Enriquez to explain whether he is lying only to the extent of attempting to palm off another man's letter as that of the Archbishop of Michoacan, or whether he invented the whole letter and signed another name, to avoid incarceration in the penitentiary for forgery. This, you see, would be a real danger, because both Señor Enriquez and the real Archbishop of Michoacan are now in the United States, where forgery is punishable, and where the fact that a man happens to be a clergyman of any rank, does not prevent his securing the protection of the law.

Americans will quickly see that in Mexico, under the rule of the Constitutionalists, a clergyman dare not even suggest his ideas on *any subject* without danger of being looked upon as a traitor.

ENRIQUEZ.—*At the same time while they are demanding protection for their co-religionists in Mexico, Germany is devastating one Catholic country after another.*

Answer.—Germany is engaged in a war. Catholics of Germany are fighting for their country, as are Catholics of England, Belgium and France for theirs. Neither side is in a war of destruction against religion. If churches and religious houses suffer, it is not *because* they are buildings consecrated to God, but because they are in the line of fire. If priests and sisters are killed, it is not *because* they are priests and sisters, but because they happen to be on duty where the shots fall. Bullets do not select landing-places for themselves. Mexico, however, is at war with no other country. She is killing her own citizens to settle political questions that long ago she promised to settle with ballots. She is in the hands of anarchy, upheld by disciples of anarchy, who destroy churches and religious houses *because they are churches and religious houses*. She kills and exiles priests and sisters *because they are priests and sisters, and for no other reason*. There lies the difference.

ENRIQUEZ.—*The cries of clergymen that the United States swoop down upon Mexico and at the point of a gun perpetuate the power of the Catholic Church, is in itself the greatest indictment against the leaders who are working in that direction. . . . The American people and the*

Washington Administration are beginning to realize that not all is well with high Catholic dignitaries in Mexico.

Answer.—Why drag in the Washington Administration? If the Washington Administration has no right to concern itself about the affairs of Mexico, as Mr. Carranza has time and time again intimated to the Administration in most insulting terms, what interest has the Washington Administration in the condition of the “high Catholic dignitaries in Mexico”? What interest has the Senate and Congress of the United States, to whom the Señor has been careful to send his pamphlet? Your “First Chief” has told the United States to mind its own business, yet you insist now that it should consider the Catholic Clergy. Is not this asking intervention of your own kind?

Now *we* do not want intervention of any kind. We want the noise in the next house, which threatens to give us no rest at all, stopped permanently, when it does stop. It is *our right* to recognize a neighbor or refuse to recognize him. We have already exercised that right with Mexico, and we can exercise it again. We can say to Mexico: “Live up to your professions; take the pledge and keep it; then I’ll recognize you, not before.” Do you see the point, Señor? Our Government is *representative*, and there is no member of it who does not know that fact. There is a *sentiment* aroused now by the wholesale killings, and robberies, and crimes of your friends. That sentiment will not down. It is speaking to you now, and its voice is penetrating enough to be heard as far as Mexico, *via* representative government.

It is scarcely necessary for me to ask how long it has been since this good Catholic from Mexico has been to confession; how long since he has seen the inside of a Catholic church for spiritual purposes; how long since he has heard a Catholic sermon; and how much he knows of a very small but compact little book of doctrine known as the Penny Catechism. Had he known the little book, he would have known that the Founder of the religion he says he professes, hated a liar and condemned him to penalties equivalent almost to that of living under the Constitutionals. He would have known that “to bear false witness against your neighbor” is one of the crimes forbidden by the Commandments given on Mount Sinai. Had he listened to sermons, he would have known that it is the mission of the Church to teach, and her glory to educate the people and to uplift the poor. He would have known that any law made in manifest opposition to that right, is a law for which no Christian nation can have any sympathy, or could tolerate. He would have known that the worst of all forms of tyranny is that tyranny which strikes at the natural rights of mankind. Had he placed his case before the tribunal of penance, he

would have known that theft, sacrilege, lust and murder can not be apologized for, but are simply crimes in the eyes of God and man. If the Señor Enriquez is a "faithful" Mexican Catholic, I would pray daily to deliver me from the evil of many such as he. But since it is plain that he is an utter stranger to the truths that his Faith would have taught him, had he given it a chance, I will ask him to open another book, the Constitution of the United States of America, and read the principles that are the foundation of the liberties enjoyed by the people of a democracy which has proven a success, and in which the State has no quarrel with the Church, and the Church no quarrel with the State. He could there learn what principles underlie the convictions of the American people, and see how foolishly have his friends acted, in their desire to win our friendship, by presuming that we are anarchists instead of republicans.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said that no State could exist "half slave and half free." He might have gone farther and said: that there can be no pariahs in a democracy. The Constitutionalists have proclaimed their intention of adding to the Laws of Reform and disfranchising the clergy. In other words, they want a nominal democracy in Mexico, with the clergy for pariahs. They want to cut off one of the largest sections of their educated population from using that education for the benefit of their country. There is something to be said, but very little, in favor of the idea that state servants should abstain from voting, but what can be said for the idea that churchmen, receiving no support from the State, and living on the free offerings of the people whom they serve, should be deprived of one of the first and most essential rights of citizenship. The Señor Enriquez may say, perhaps, that it is because they disobey the laws. He has already intimated that we must face that charge against the clergy of Mexico. Very well, we will face it, face it gladly, pleased, indeed, that he gives us the opportunity.

The clergy have "ignored the laws," he says, of the Mexican Republic. He means that the clergy have disobeyed these laws — that the Church has disobeyed them. And it is perfectly true that the Church has had institutions of learning and of charity in Mexico contrary to the Laws of Reform. It is also true that Mexico has had, during all the reign of General Diaz, a dictatorship; and it is also true that, under that dictatorship, the existence of these institutions was known to the government. It is the government's business to enforce its laws if it wants to enforce them; and when it does not enforce them, it recognizes the fundamental injustice of them. But leave that aside. The Church has disobeyed the laws of Mexico; but she has disobeyed them to a far less degree than the early Christians disobeyed the laws of the Roman Empire; than the

Pilgrim Fathers disobeyed the laws of Great Britain; than the American Colonists disobeyed the laws which imposed the Stamp Tax; than Andreas Hofer disobeyed the laws of Austria; than Irish Catholics and Quakers disobeyed the laws of England; than Hidalgo disobeyed the laws of Spain. Would the Señor Enriquez applaud or condemn disobedience in that?

There are some fundamental rights that the common mind of the human race holds to be above the laws. We do not all agree how far these rights extend, how much is included in them, yet no one doubts but that *the conscience* answers to God and not to human laws. When the Catholic Church in Mexico built her schools and established her works of charity, she did disobey the Laws of Reform. When a country priest in Mexico walked in his cassock to a poor, dying peon, and administered the last sacraments at his bedside, which was outside a church building, clearly he disobeyed the same laws. When three or four good women lived in community for the purpose of nursing the sick, teaching the ignorant or caring for orphans, they were in disobedience of the laws, though the brothel down the street, with its two dozen prostitutes, was not disobeying them. When a Christian Brother taught the poor children to read and write, he certainly was violating the law, and some of them paid the penalty when they fell bullet-ridden at Zacatecas. Yes, the Catholic clergy have disobeyed certain laws; and had they not done so during the last two generations, I question much if the Señor Enriquez would now be able even to read, much less to write; and if the educated class of Mexico would be in existence at all, for most of them received all the education they have from these religious teachers, who violated the Laws of Reform in giving it to them. But in doing this, the clergy did not violate the higher law of God. But they did run risks and raised up against themselves a band of ingrates, whose ingratitude is without parallel in the history of the world.

Señor: Very justly leaving in solitary infamy, as it deserves, the deed that was done on the World's Redeemer by the Tragedy of Calvary, many men — poets, statesmen, historians — have tried to ascertain the basest deed of ingratitude ever wrought. Not one of them has succeeded; for, in ignoble procession history has passed before them, sons who killed their fathers, false friends who slew true friends, daughters who scorned their mothers, wives who stained their husbands' names, rulers who betrayed their people, Catalines who outbetrayed a Brutus, Henrys who outslaughtered a Richard, Neros who outrivaled every other matricide. The task of finding the Mountain of Ingratitude has hitherto proven too great even for a world's quest.

Señor: It is no longer necessary to search. The quest is ended. Not *one* man, but a body of men, flaunting the sacred flag of liberty, invoking the holy name of God, have arisen to curse the Mother who bore them to the family of Civilization, the Mother who guided their shaking steps toward the haven of Truth; the Mother who led them out of the bondage of savagery, away from the temples wherein their ancestors' blood drenched red the stones of the altars of pagan sacrifice. Infamy has found sons, who, claiming their Mother's name, have yet tried to dishonor her; who, protected by the love she so freely gave to all her children, returned a hatred worse than the worst she has known from her most relentless enemies; whose plans, conceived in malice and laid in darkness, are to tear even the faithful from her protecting heart, and drive the Mother herself from the home she builded and ornamented with her labor, into the desert of the world's contempt; whose brutality has outdone the brute; whose malice has been more malicious than revenge; whose lust has been more unsparing than sin's, without any of sin's weak excuses; whose greed has been more rapacious than that of the shark, because even satiety does not appease it.

Señor: There has been written by your friends, the bloodiest and most disgraceful chapter in the history of this new continent, a chapter which now takes from France the shameful badge she has hated to wear, the red badge that marked her as having given to the world its Greatest Terror. They, your friends, have put upon America this crowning infamy, and have left to poor Mexico the bearing of the shame of it, until some, more ungrateful, more vile and more loathsome than yourselves, may arise in the dark days that are to come to outdo you in the effectiveness of your work of destruction. Your country is in the grasp of anarchy. Your coinage is debased. Your riches are in the coffers of strangers. Your people cry for peace. Your children cry for bread. Your temples are profaned. The seats of your judges have been cast down. Your halls of legislation are silent. The chair of your authority is the prey of bandits; and your women — God help them — mothers of your citizens yet unborn, go into mourning for the black memory of the worse than death that has fallen upon them. Mexico, a spectacle for angels and men, no longer can rise to accuse you, for gagged and manacled, she awaits the impending stroke of grace.

Señor: God is not to be mocked. He has been more than patient, but even Infinite Patience must merge into Infinite Justice. Blood calls to the Blood shed on Calvary for peace, and the Blood of Calvary will answer. Outraged Innocence prays to Eternal Innocence, to vindicate purity; and the cry will not echo back to earth unheeded. To-day, in

the noise of the din of a world at war, men can not hear the plaint of poor Mexico; but the Ear of Eternal Justice is not stopped, and the clouds of battle shut out from His Eye no spot on earth where evil deeds are done. There is a new Day of Atonement to come, for there is a God of nations, Who "slumbers not nor sleeps."

"The Religious Question in Mexico"

A REPLY TO MR. LUIS CABRERA

By

FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY

Author of "The Book of Red and Yellow"

Mr. Luis Cabrera, right hand of Don Venustiano Carranza, has come forward with a "reply" to "The Book of Red and Yellow," on behalf of the Constitutionalists. His work was published in Spanish at Vera Cruz, in a few Mexican papers of the United States, in the *Forum* magazine, and lately in pamphlet form by the Carranza junta in New York. Such a well-circulated "reply" deserves to have the dignity of special attention, which I hope to give it in this pamphlet.

Mr. Cabrera, as a citizen of Mexico, should, however, be known to those about to be introduced to Mr. Cabrera as an author and apologist.

My inquiries regarding his public career resulted in the following interesting statements: The gentleman is a lawyer who practiced in Mexico City, where some people gave him the name of "El Renagado," which, being translated, means "The Renegade." This name was applied because of his activity on behalf of a foreign corporation which held the estate called "El Tlahualilo," and against which the Mexican Government was proceeding. I make no comment on the justice or injustice of Mr. Cabrera's nickname. He had it. The gentleman was also something of a journalist. He wrote many letters upholding the idea of Revolution, for which he was rewarded by being made an important man in the government of President Madero, who appointed him President of the Law School of the University. The students, however, objected, and went on a strike, stating that such an appointment was a disgrace to the school.

Mr. Cabrera was then "elected" to Congress, presumably by the usual Mexican method. There he represented, principally, Mr. Gustavo Madero. He led a body in Congress called "la porra," a group using howling mobs to support, by shouts and invectives, the policies of the great Gustavo.

Mr. Cabrera's activities as a lawyer led him, more than once, to stir up international difficulties for the Government of Mexico. Those who know him mention often the case of the mine business of S. Gerenimo Taviche in the State of Oaxaca.

Mr. Cabrera does not love those who stand for religion of any kind. He is particularly opposed to convents and nuns. His family, however — so it was stated to me — is in refuge, safe from his fellow Constitutionalists, and protected in a convent of Catholic nuns at Barcelona, in Spain. Consistency, then, is no jewel in the crown of Mr. Luis Cabrera.

I mentioned that Mr. Cabrera is now connected with the Constitutionalists, but perhaps I must revise that statement; since recently I read in Mexican dispatches that a little misunderstanding had arisen in Carranza Cabinet councils, and that this gentleman, with two other shining lights, had withdrawn. In fact, the dispatches intimated that Mr. Cabrera had gone from Vera Cruz to the healthier climate of Progreso. His "reply," the one now under dissection, was dated "Merida." In these days of modern democracy, the old saying about the uneasiness of "the head that wears a crown," might be changed to the still more palpable truth, that there is much uneasiness for the heads that do the systematic lying for the Constitutionalist faction of Mexico. However, Mr. Cabrera seems to be again with Mr. Carranza — at least he was two weeks ago.

Before going farther, it will be necessary for me to say, for Mr. Cabrera's enlightenment, that the name of the author of "The Book of Red and Yellow" is not "Francisco Elguero," but Francis (Francisco if you wish, Señor) Clement Kelley. Mr. Cabrera made what might charitably be called a mistranslation when he rendered my name "Francisco Elguero." Is it possible that he *preferred* to render it thus? It happens, you see, that Francisco Elguero is also a journalist, is also a lawyer, also a leader in a political party, but opposed to Mr. Cabrera. Is it possible that Mr. Cabrera translated my name as he did, so as to make it appear that his enemy had been doing something very reprehensible in Constitutionalist eyes — telling the truth? Thus, you see, he might kill two birds with one stone — answer, "The Book of Red and Yellow," and doom to dark destruction his able rival. If Mr. Cabrera had that in mind, my respect for his ability increases, in proportion as my respect for his honesty decreases.

Let me make a few selections from the Citizen Cabrera's answer, and add to each one some comments in my own.

CABRERA.—*The Catholic clergy (of Mexico) are now doing the same work in foreign countries that they did in 1859 and 1860.*

Answer.—For the enlightenment of Americans who have not closely followed the history of Mexico, I wish to explain that Mr. Cabrera refers here to the French intervention and the setting up of an Empire in Mexico under Maximilian. This was done, however, not by the clergy, but through the influence of the Conservative Party of Mexico, a political

faction not in any way connected with the Church. It is true that some of the clergy, including the Archbishop of Mexico City, were members of the party, just as the Democratic or Republican parties in this country have followers among the clergy of all denominations. There have always been certain clergymen of Mexico in the Liberal Party, and certain clergymen in the Conservative Party. One might as easily blame the Catholic clergy of the United States for the war with Spain, because Archbishop Ireland was a Republican, as blame the clergy of Mexico for French intervention because Archbishop Le Bastida was a Conservative. Mexico at that time was suffering as it suffers to-day — from revolution. As Mr. Cabrera himself states, it was a far more bloody revolution than even the one of which he is a distinguished leader. He says himself that the old revolution affected his country far more deeply than the present one. That explains much. Sick at heart, the leaders of the Conservative Party invited the intervention, as Mr. Cabrera says, of Spain, France and England. France intervened and, with the consent of the Conservative Party, an emperor was sent to Mexico. France did not intend to permanently occupy the country; but did intend to uphold the Empire until such time as it was properly established. The Empire, however, was to be Mexican, not French. The country was given a constitution. All promised well enough; but the Empire idea was not in accord with the Monroe Doctrine. The setting up of a foreign ruler, however, could scarcely have meant the enslaving of Mexico. William of Orange became King of England on the invitation of an English party, and, while the Irish have presumed to doubt his success, English historians have been rather kind to him. George the First of England was a German. He could not even speak the English language; but he set up a dynasty which has adopted, and has been adopted by, the English. One of German George's descendants is busy to-day fighting his ancestors. So, even if Maximilian's government had been successful, that would not have meant necessarily the curtailing of the liberties of the Mexicans. It might even have meant something like the prosperity of England.

Mr. Cabrera asserts that the Catholic clergy set up the Maximilian government, while, as a matter of fact, the clergy were just as much divided over the question of finding means to stop the bloodshed and warfare and destruction of 1860 as were the rest of the people. Mr. Cabrera may be a lawyer, but he evidently is not a logician. It seems that if he can find the name of a single Catholic clergyman who had anything to do with a movement of which he himself does not approve, he considers it sufficient reason for condemning all the Catholic clergy and the whole Catholic Church of Mexico. A schoolboy would reason better. Was the

Episcopal Church responsible for the Southern Confederacy because an Episcopal bishop, Polk, fought in the Confederate ranks?

CABRERA.—*The people of the United States have been led to believe that the Catholic religion in Mexico has no freedom whatever.*

Answer.—Very true; but they have been led to believe it because it has been proven to them, and that in the most effective way possible — by Mr. Luis Cabrera himself, as I will presently show.

CABRERA.—*The Catholic clergy (of Mexico) have invoked the aid of the American Catholic Church for the purpose of obtaining the influence of their country, and even its intervention against Mexico, to destroy the work of Juarez.*

Answer.—The Catholic clergy of Mexico have done nothing of the kind. They have been living very quietly in exile at different points in the United States on the charity of their fellow Catholics; for they came to us denuded of all they had, some of them dressed as peons, through the zeal for "religion and liberty" of Mr. Cabrera and his friends. When American Catholics saw their sad condition, they were filled with indignation, and this indignation was not confined to Catholics alone, but was shared by Protestants. Then Americans began to study Mexico and learned about the Laws of Reform. We knew that no country calling itself a democracy can live under such tyranny; so we, Catholics as well as Protestants — but all Americans — called the attention of our Government to these laws, and told our people exactly what the Constitutionalists aimed at. The Mexican clergy had nothing whatever to do with the matter. It was *Americans* who pointed out to the *American* Government the deception practiced by the Carranzistas; and *Americans* will continue to point this out, until Mexico begins to learn that democracy and tyranny are not synonymous terms.

CABRERA.—*The propaganda of the Mexican bishops and clergy in the United States aims at making the Constitutionalists appear as denying guarantees of liberty and as persecuting the Roman Catholic clergy.*

Answer.—There was no need of such a propaganda. Mr. Cabrera himself says that religious bodies should be absolutely without what he calls "temporal power"; by which he means that the Church (and this includes all denominations, as he specifically states) should have no right to own any buildings, any land, any investments within the territory of Mexico. Should any church own land, buildings or investments, they must be confiscated at once to the State, which is justified in either using them itself for its own purposes, selling them, or giving them to private citizens. The Church can not inherit or transfer anything it possesses;

in other words, nothing can be set aside for the endowment of religious institutions; nor can a church have any real possessions whatever. The State, he claims, has a right to determine how many churches the people need, no matter how many they built. The State has a right to take church property and do as it pleases with it. The clergy, he contends, have no right to hold property, and if they do hold it as private citizens only, the State should investigate to see if, perhaps, they intend to make a religious or charitable use of it; in which case the State should take it. Of course, if the clergy intend using it for gambling purposes, or for houses of ill-fame, or mescal shops, the State could *not* take it. These purposes are presumably lawful, and proper for the preservation of society and for the good of the Republic. No clergyman should, according to Mr. Cabrera, speak about politics or take any interest whatever in the political affairs of his country, or use his influence directly or indirectly to that end. There should be no trust to hold property belonging to a church, and if such a trust is made, the legal heirs ought to come in and take the property on the death of those who compose the trust. That this has been done Mr. Cabrera himself asserts, for he says that "the Church often lost her property by its being demanded by the legal heirs of the apparent owner." These are just a few of the admissions that Mr. Cabrera makes. I do not think that the Mexican bishops and clergy could go any farther than Mr. Cabrera has gone.

As to the charge that the Constitutionlists persecuted the Roman Catholic clergy, Mr. Cabrera will perhaps remember that the list of murders, robberies, tortures, etc., made in "The Book of Red and Yellow" were quite numerous and were mostly given under oath.

It may also be a matter of interest to the gentleman to know that the only activity the Mexican bishops exiled in the United States showed was when some indignant Americans proposed intervention. Then, to a man, the Mexican clergy used their influence on their Catholic brethren in the United States *to oppose such intervention*. How do I know this? Because, for the good of Mexico, as I thought, I myself was in favor of intervention, and it was through the influence of the Mexican bishops that I changed my mind and actively interested myself before the American Government in opposition to it; as is shown clearly by my correspondence with the President and the Secretary of State. If Mr. Cabrera thinks that by these false charges against the Mexican clergy he is going to raise up enemies for them among their people, he will have to reckon with the translation and circulation in Spanish of these letters among the citizens of the Mexican Republic. He is not dealing now with a quiet, long-suffering Mexican Hierarchy. He is dealing with sixteen million Catholic citizens of the United States, and a good many others who are not Catholics, but who

know their rights, who know their duties, and who have long ago gotten past the time when they are going to stand for any nonsense.

CABRERA.—*I have written the following article with the purpose of making the American people know the real position of the Mexican clergy.*

Answer.—But you have entirely omitted saying anything except on your own unqualified statement. Are you a lawyer, or do you only make a pretense at practicing law? If you are a lawyer, do you always go to court with a speech but no evidence?

CÁBRERA.—*The religious question in Mexico has been misunderstood in the United States because the position of the Catholic Church in Mexico is far different from that of the position of the same Church in the United States. In Mexico ninety-nine per cent of the population belong to the Roman Catholic creed; therefore, the influence of the Catholic clergy in our religious matters has no opposition at all.*

Answer.—Well, we dense Yankees, perhaps, have a mistaken idea as to what opposition is. Churches looted and destroyed, colleges razed to the ground, schools closed, teachers expelled, religious women assaulted, Christian Brothers and priests murdered, laws made limiting religious rites, prohibition of religious ceremonies, edicts forbidding preaching and the teaching of Sunday-school, these things we call *opposition* in English. What do you call them in Spanish, or rather in Mexican, or better still, in Constitutionalist Mexican? And what do you intend to prove by showing that ninety-nine per cent of the population of Mexico belongs to the Catholic faith? Does that mean that a ninety-nine per cent of Catholic population justifies anti-religious laws? If so, logically, ninety-nine per cent of a Methodist population in the United States would justify the American people in cutting the throats of the Methodist ministers, smashing their educational system to atoms, expelling their deaconesses and outraging some of them. What kind of logic is this for a lawyer; and what difference, please, would it make to the United States if all her people were religious or belonged to one denomination, so far as her laws are concerned? The principles of justice are the same, no matter what the religious conditions are, and no matter how strong any denomination may be. The principles of democracy are the same. Must it be admitted, then, that as soon as any religious denomination in the United States is in a majority it should be suppressed; or is toleration not possible for the religious opinions of a majority? Tell us, Citizen Cabrera, who has governed Mexico for the last eighty years: the majority of ninety-nine per cent Catholics, or the minority of one per cent atheists? Isn't it a fact that the one per cent has governed? Isn't it a fact that the so-called Liberals have had absolute control, and that their oppressive laws have

been put on the statute books so as to keep that control? Isn't it a fact that your one per cent has been grafting on the nation, enriching itself, and handing down its legacies of graft to its children. Have the ninety-nine per cent no rights? Then, why do *you* talk for the nation? Does the ninety-nine per cent form part of that nation, or does the nation exist for the one per cent. We who are democrats would like to know these things.

CABRERA.—*In the United States there are other religious denominations which counteract the influence of the Catholic Church.*

Answer.—And yet these religious denominations have not seen fit, though they are in the majority, to deny the Catholic Church the same rights that they possess. They do not seem to believe it wise to destroy *all* liberty by attempting to legislate against the liberty of *some* of their neighbors.

CABRERA.—*The Laws of Reform aim to take all her power from the Church and to establish her absolute independence from the State.*

Answer.—“Absolute independence” is good. If I meet my neighbor on the street, knock him down, batter his face beyond recognition, break his arm and tie his legs so that he can not get away, then carry him to jail and lock him up permanently, I suppose I am then *establishing his absolute independence.*

CABRERA.—*The Revolution of Ayutla, in the years 1856 to 1859, aimed at despoiling the Church of her economical power and her social influence, and should, therefore, have put the Church in a condition which, apparently unjust and disadvantageous, was really the only possible means to make the Catholic clergy impotent.*

Answer.—So that was the object of the revolution: to render the Catholic clergy impotent, to make it impossible for the religious leaders of ninety-nine per cent of the people to lead, to counteract their influence and to make them slaves of the one per cent? That this was “unjust and disadvantageous” is certainly apparent; the idea being an application of the old saying that “the only good Indian is a dead Indian,” and the only way to have religion is to suppress it.

CABRERA.—*Maximilian himself did not dare to destroy the work done during the time of Juarez.*

Answer.—Was that the reason why Juarez shot Maximilian? But your statement is perfectly true. Why did Maximilian not repeal the Laws of Reform? Because French influence forced him to make a secret compact with Napoleon III. that he would not do so. It was *foreign*, and not *Mexican*, influence that upheld the Laws of Reform. Maximilian's

action was directly contrary to the agreement he made with Miramon when the crown was offered him. It was the most unpopular thing Maximilian did; and it helped to dethrone him. But where, O Citizen Cabrera, is now your argument that Maximilian was governed by the Catholic clergy? You are still limping terribly on the side of your logic.

CABRERA.—*At the present time there are in the Mexican Constitution some precepts which correspond to the Laws of Reform, and, according to the same Constitution, the laws and the authorities must enforce them.*

Answer.—But, my dear Sir, there are other precepts in the Constitution of your country which concern “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” Must not “all authorities and laws” enforce these also? Then, why is your Don Venustiano governing by edicts? Why have you set aside all the other provisions of the Constitution except the anti-religious ones? Why have you had a dictatorship for over fifty years? Why have you had no honest elections? You defend the anti-religious acts of General Diaz, who made a football of the Constitution, and you are a Cabinet officer of Carranza who has made a lost golf ball of it.

CABRERA.—*The proposition of the Constitutional Government regarding the Catholic Church of Mexico is only to strictly enforce the Laws of Reform, which up to now have been violated.*

Answer.—And yet you say that they were apparently “unjust and disadvantageous,” while Juarez said that they were “tyrannical.” You say you want peace in Mexico, and you say also that the Catholics have no right to agitate for a repeal of tyrannical laws, or to ask for any relief, while ninety-nine per cent of the people are Catholic. If these laws only must be enforced, and the ninety-nine per cent have no right whatever to express their desire to be relieved of them, please tell the American people, and the Mexican people, too, in what the government you desire differs from that of an absolute monarchy. Do you want a democracy, or do you want a perpetual tyranny? You can not have both at the same time.

CABRERA.—*These laws must remain.*

Answer.—Surely! The one per cent wants them. Then it is tyranny you want. Americans are grateful to you for telling them frankly what to expect of you. That statement we will proceed also to lay before the Washington authorities, who have been laboring under the impression that you want *liberty* in Mexico. Once more, we beg to assure you, that you are not dealing with the Mexican clergy. You are dealing with American citizens, who believe in a republican form of government and the elemental principles of liberty.

CABRERA.—*The Church should be without temporal power, and as an organized body should not interfere in political matters.*

Answer.—So that if the Catholics, or the Presbyterians, or Methodists, or any other religious body in Mexico that now exists, or might exist in the future, desires to change the laws which oppress them, they would have no right to make such propositions. Carry this out logically. If there is a tariff law in Mexico which oppresses and renders impossible of operation the hemp industry of Yucatan, and the merchants band themselves together to agitate for such changes as will give them the right to exist, new Laws of Reform will have to be passed to take away from these merchants all their citizenship rights, and to prevent them from expressing an opinion, voting, or doing anything else to save themselves. Is that the idea?

CABRERA.—*We Constitutionalists are Catholic; Villistas are Catholic; Zapatistas are Catholic as well.*

Answer.—How long is it since you attended Mass?

CABRERA.—*The Constitutionalist Party could not intend to prevent Catholics, who are practically the entire Mexican people, either from professing their religion, or from taking a part in political matters.*

Answer.—Well, they made a very good attempt at it, anyhow. Catholics may profess their religion in Mexico, of course, *provided they do not profess it openly*. They can *think* that they are Catholics, but it is dangerous to say that they are Catholics. If they say that they are Catholics, for example, they could not hope to be Presidents or Cabinet officers, or Judges, or Senators, or *Jefes Politicos*, or even superintendents of street cleaning; but it would be conceded probably that they could hold the minor offices. They might dig ditches, sweep out the public buildings, or herd sheep. There is no actual objection to Catholics working with their hands, provided they do not interfere with any remunerative job desired by the one per cent of Liberals. They may vote, of course, but then *they must not count the votes*; neither must they make political speeches, nor write about politics. In other words, they may be “hewers of wood and drawers of water.” They are permitted to exist as long as they pay their taxes into the treasuries, which are under the control of the gracious Constitutionalists, and which are for their personal use.

CABRERA.—*The Mexican clergy, and generally, the Church, abstained for a long time from taking any part in our politics.*

Answer.—One of the most necessary things for a lawyer in drawing up a brief is to remember in the second paragraph what he said in the

first. Evidently Mr. Cabrera is not a good lawyer, because this statement is in direct contradiction to about every other statement he made in his excellent "reply."

CABRERA.—*During the government of General Diaz, the clergy did not intend to organize themselves for political battles. On the other hand, they appeared as strictly submitted to the laws of the country.*

Answer.—Then why did you and your fellow Constitutionalists rebel against the government of General Diaz? It seems to have been quite your ideal. You do not obey any part of the Constitution except that part which suppresses the clergy; neither did General Diaz for a long time. But you were not satisfied with that. You arranged a little revolution to put him out of office. You did it, you say, because you wanted him to obey the Constitution; but now you are objecting to the clergy because they obeyed it. Would you, please, Citizen, tell us just what you do want? Frankly, your type of mind is beyond ordinary comprehension. Why, then, do you charge that the Catholic clergy were allied with Diaz, when you confess that they simply obeyed the laws and did not interfere in politics?

CABRERA.—*When General Diaz retired from power and Mr. Francisco Leon de la Barra occupied the Presidency, the Catholic clergy thought that the time was come when they should organize themselves for the political struggle. Therefore, a political party was formed under the auspices of the Catholic clergy and chiefly composed of landlords.*

Answer.—But later on you state that this party won considerable success at the polls; in fact, had thirty per cent of the representatives of Congress. Are the landlords in such a tremendous majority in Mexico that they could elect so many? We understood in the United States that in Mexico there were a few landlords who oppressed the overwhelming majority of the people. Then we understand that the Constitution gives only one vote to each person. Which is wrong — our understanding of the Constitution and of the proportion of landlords to the people, or your statement that the landlords chiefly composed the new party? It is either one or the other. Which horn of the dilemma is the more comfortable for you to sit upon? Again, perhaps you will remember that no political parties were permitted to actively exist under General Diaz, but you state that when the Catholic de la Barra became President, political parties could exist. Then the Catholic President was trying to give you a democracy? Now, then, wasn't it a democracy you wanted? If you did not want that, what objection had you to General Diaz? If you did want it, wherein lay the crime of de la Barra?

CABRERA.—*The Catholic clergy began to make the propaganda of the Catholic Party first in a rather discreet way.*

Answer.— Thank you.

CABRERA.—*But afterwards they did it openly.*

Answer.— Which, of course, is reprehensible, because the Liberals did their work in secret lodges.

CABRERA.—*And by oppressing the masses.*

Answer.— How? Did they forbid the masses to vote, to own property, to leave what they had to the cause they considered most worthy? Did they take away their houses from them, or their investments? Did they forbid them citizenship rights? Explain. That is just what the Constitutionalists did to the Catholic clergy. Did the clergy teach them that? How did they do it? They were not in power. They had no governmental influence. Oppression of the masses are big words to use, but they require some elucidation.

CABRERA.—*When de la Barra was provisional President, the Catholic Party intended to rob the revolution of the fruits of its triumph by appointing the same de la Barra as a candidate for the Presidency of the Republic.*

Answer.— Was de la Barra a citizen of Mexico? What says the Mexican Constitution? Did he have a right to run for President? Did the people have a right to elect him? Who was to be the final judge, the Constitutionalists or the people? Then, wherein lay the crime against the rights of the people of any party nominating *any* citizen, or *any* citizen running, for the office of President? Truly, your ideas of a Republic are strangely at variance with those recognized by other nations. But a more important matter is that the Catholic Party *did not nominate de la Barra, and that he did not run for President.* There were only two candidates for President at that election — Madero and Reyes. Another point: did not Madero himself praise the Catholic Party as the first fruit of his revolution, hailing it as a sign of the liberty of organization which his government was going to inaugurate in Mexico, and did he not thus praise the party even in the Senate chamber?

CABRERA.—*In the elections of 1911, the candidacy of the Constitutional-Progressive Party won against the candidacy of the Catholic Party, and since that moment it (the Catholic Party) became one of the principal enemies of the government of Mr. Francisco I. Madero.*

Answer.— From what I have heard from Mexican Catholics, they were all inclined to consider Madero as one willing to grant them more justice

than any previous President had granted. The bishops especially seemed rather favorably disposed toward him; but, even if they had been against him, Mr. Cabrera can give the reason. Madero himself decided that not more than thirty Catholic deputies would be permitted to sit in Congress. Mr. Cabrera was the gentleman to whom was assigned the task of carrying out these orders. He refused to accept fifty credentials from elected representatives who were Catholics, and some of even those representatives who were not Catholics but who were decent men. The reasons given for rejection were varied: one was that the form of certificate was not legal; but in order to find this out, Mr. Cabrera must have used the X-ray, for he did not even take the trouble to break the seals on the credentials. When he was taxed with this wholesale ignoring of the will of the people, he stated, in full assembly of the Credentials Committee, that "*above injustice was the convenience of the Constitutionalist-Progressive Party.*" Let me see, does Mexico exist for the good of her people, or for the convenience of the Constitutionalist-Progressive Party?

CABRERA.—*The Catholic clergy, both directly and through the Catholic Party, was one of the principal factors in the fall of Madero; and though their candidate for the Presidency was not Huerta, it is a matter of fact that their leader — de la Barra — was in the Cabinet which decreed the murder of Madero and Pino Suarez.*

Answer.—The murder of Madero and Pino Suarez was decreed by three men well known to Mr. Cabrera, and not by the Huerta Cabinet, nor by General Huerta himself. But even if the Cabinet had decreed it, the fact that de la Barra was in the Cabinet would prove only de la Barra's guilt. He was not the candidate of the Catholic Party for President, nor was he the leader of the party, or even a member of the party. The Catholic clergy had nothing to do with the fall of Madero, as Mr. Cabrera knows; for in the fall of Madero the Catholic people of Mexico lost their last chance for even a semblance of justice. Mark well, I do not say *justice*; I say a *semblance* of justice. The Catholics of Mexico had been oppressed so long that even the semblance would have satisfied them.

CABRERA.—*Afterwards the Catholic Party secured important positions for its principal leaders in the government of Huerta, and afterward supported the candidacy of Mr. Frederic Gamboa for President of the Republic.*

Answer.—The party had named itself "Catholic" without the consent of the Church. The Church had nothing to do with the rebellion against Madero, as is proved by the collective pastoral of the bishops issued in January, 1913, at Zamora, which condemned the rebellion in the most public manner and to all the faithful. For the purpose of winning

over the Catholic Party, Huerta appointed a Catholic to his Cabinet. Congress would not permit him to accept. The Catholic Party, too, was dissatisfied, because it recognized the fact that the appointment was only a bid for a support which it could not consistently give to General Huerta.

CABRERA.— *This work was done, not through the individual efforts which a man has a right to give to any political party, but by using the religious influence of the clergy upon the people — the pulpit and the confessional.*

Answer.— If ninety-nine per cent of the people of Mexico were Catholic, as you say, and the Catholic clergy really used their influence through "the pulpit and the confessional" upon them, where would the Constitutionalists be to-day? The fact that there are Constitutionalists at all is the most striking proof that the clergy did not interfere in politics in any such way.

CABRERA.— *During the struggle against Huerta, the adverse and unjust opinion found in all cities occupied by the Constitutionalists was a surprise to them. It seemed to be a paradox.*

Answer.— All the cities, did you say? But you tried to impress upon Mr. Lind, the representative of President Wilson, that the people were all for you. Now it appears that they were all against you. But you want a democracy. Then what were you fighting for, and by what right do you fight now? Who rules, anyhow, or at least who is supposed to rule? You decide what you think the people ought to have, then you tie the thing up into a ball and force it down their throats at the point of a bayonet. It is no wonder that the Mexicans are being choked.

CABRERA.— *The strong opposition found by the Constitutionalists in some cities under the form of Social Armed Defense was not a sign of sympathy toward Huerta, but it was occasioned by a kind of horror toward the revolutionary soldiers, whom the Catholic clergy made appear as bandits who intended to take possession of towns and villages in order to rob, to loot, violate women, and murder.*

Answer.— And in order to prove that this was an unjust judgment on the Constitutionalists by the people, when you did take the towns and villages, you looted, you robbed, you violated the women and you committed murder. It was a fine way to show the people that you were not bandits, that you were simply working for their own good, and to preserve their homes and their property and their most sacred rights. But have you even told the truth about this "Social Defense"? The "Social Defense" of the different places like Moralia, La Piedad, etc., was really against bandits. When the actual troops of the Constitutionalists came

to the city they were welcomed, because the people believed their promise that they would restore law and order. After they had begun their "work of restoration of law and order," the people prayed God to send the bandits along. What about the 1,300 carloads of loot taken out of Mexico City to Vera Cruz by Carranza?

CABRERA.— *The work of the clergy to form an adverse opinion to the Constitutionalists explains — even if it may not justify — many of the aggressions committed by the soldiers against the members of it.*

Answer.— Again I owe you thanks, Sir, for the little concession that the murders and other aggressions against the clergy were unjustified; also that they were committed. Mr. Tumulty please note.

CABRERA.— *But it is very natural that, after a political struggle, the military element felt disappointed, knowing the effects of the clerical propaganda against the revolution, and that instead of remaining within stated limits have, on some occasions, exceeded them and tried to interfere in some questions of a merely religious character.*

Answer.— For example, at the Constitutionalist Convention at Aguascalientes. Does that explain the address of that strong upholder of Carranza who presided — General Antonio I. Villareal, graduate of American penitentiaries, pupil of the Ferrer School of Anarchy in Barcelona?

CABRERA.— *The burning of the confessional boxes especially was a manifestation of the disappointment of the revolutionary forces, for the abuse of the Sacrament of Confession done by the Catholic clergy when they used it as a political weapon.*

Answer.— It was too bad that the clergy did such a thing. They must have interfered seriously with the liberty of the citizens Villareal, Garza, Obregon, Villa, Cabrera and Carranza. I can imagine the effect upon these gentlemen of the instruction they received at their weekly confessions. It must have irritated them terribly; and, in the case of some of them, perhaps, it even made them hesitate about going to confession quite as often as usual; or, perhaps, they changed their confessors. That may explain why nineteen priests were taken from Mexico City to Vera Cruz, headed by Paredes, who, I suppose, now occupies the position of official confessor to the Constitutionalist Government. But who hears the confession of Paredes?

CABRERA.— *It is necessary to state again and again that the Constitutionalist Government had never intended to interfere in religious matters, or to prevent the Mexican people in the enjoyment of their religious freedom. The Constitutionalist Government does not intend to establish any laws which may affect religion or to restrain in any way religious practices.*

Answer.—That's fine; but why should they intend to establish any new laws when they have already all that are required, and which they say they have no intention of repealing, but have a decided intention of enforcing? They "do not intend to interfere in religious matters" at all, or prevent the Mexican people from enjoying religious freedom? Then, in that case, why not start by giving the Mexican people religious freedom? Why not have a separation of Church and State such as the United States has? Why not remove the restrictions which are the cause of the difficulties? Why not let the people build their churches if they need them, take care of them, take care of their clergy, offer some help to the work of education and assist the progress of civilization in Mexico? Why not get them working for the country? If the energies of the ninety-nine per cent of Catholics are to be eternally spent in securing the most elemental rights from the one per cent who govern with a stiletto, how can you ask the ninety-nine per cent to contribute anything to the sane and safe progress of Constitutional Government? But I forgot, you don't ask that. You only want them to quietly let you do as you please. But, since you wrote, Mr. Carranza has been recognized, and as a mark of his respect for your promises he has closed and seized more churches.

CABRERA.—*The Catholic clergy, before 1856, was the strongest economic power in the country.*

Answer.—Possibly. But the historians of Mexico all say that the lands rented from the Church were the lands sought by the people, because of the favorable conditions under which they were held; because the tenants were taken care of; because the children were sent to school; because the poor were fed; and because usury was not permitted. It was bad business for the other landlords, who wanted a higher rate per cent for money, like some of them who demanded from ten and twelve per cent a week. These wanted to rent their lands at their own extortionate prices. The Church was a bad competitor, because she stood for justice. It is the same story as that of the lands in the Philippine Islands that were in the possession of the Friars. It was there looked upon as a scandal that the Friars held land, but chiefly because the Chinese-Mestizo was the other landlord. This wide-awake gentleman has his way now, but it is the people who pay—they always do. And, by the way, harking back to the statement that the Constitutionalists have not interfered in religious matters; was it interfering in religious matters to throw out the legitimately appointed Vicar-General of Mexico City and nominate Father Paredes, as Carranza did? And is it an interference in religious matters to close churches, because in the opinion of the Constitutionalists they are not needed? or to say when the bells shall be rung? or what particular priest shall say Mass? or to state that none may hear confessions?

or to forbid the alms collection on Sunday? or to interfere with the administration of the Sacraments to the dying so that, even when the dying person was allowed to go to confession, a Constitutionalist representative must be present to hear it? If there is to be any new legislation in this regard, why not get up a form of absolution to be used exclusively by Constitutionalist representatives at deathbeds? The State, having all power, ought to be able to give absolution.

CABRERA.—*The clergy vigorously opposed this arrangement, because that thus their money power would be reduced considerably. Then the war called "de Reforma" or "of three years" came.*

Answer.—Does it occur to Mr. Cabrera that the clergy might have opposed these laws because they were aimed at the very basic principles of liberty and justice? However, the three years' war was not brought on, or carried on, by the clergy. It was a straight fight between the Conservative and Liberal parties in Mexico. Mr. Cabrera is constantly confusing the issue by referring to the clergy instead of the Conservative Party, when it suits him to do so. As a matter of fact, many of the members of the Conservative Party were looking for pelf just as much as were most members of the Liberal Party; and in more than one case the clergy were ground between the two stones of the mill.

CABRERA.—*The essence of the Laws of Reform regarding the Catholic Church consisted of making it impossible for the clergy to hold real estate. Such a measure may appear extreme, but was absolutely necessary . . . the measure continues to be necessary.*

Answer.—The Church was despoiled in 1859. Now, Mr. Cabrera says the spoliation must continue. But who must continue being despoiled? The people built the churches in the beginning. Every penny that went into them came from Mexicans, directly or indirectly. When the estates of the Church were taken away, only the Government benefited, and its individual friends to whom the Government sold the property for a song. When the property was sold, it was at such ridiculous prices that it was plain the Government was simply using the sale as a pretext to enrich individuals who had helped in the stealing. Some of these men became immensely wealthy. Now, no one charges that the Church sent any of the money that came from its lands out of Mexico. Every one knows that it was all used for the colleges, schools, charitable and religious institutions of the country; that the revenue was expended for the common good. When the Church lost her lands and property, and they were turned over to the Government's supporters, what became of the income? Ask the dive-keepers of Paris. One thing is certain, it is not democracy to take property that was used for the common good and hand it over for the enrichment of millionaires.

CABRERA.—*In all countries it is now admitted that the Church must have no temporal power.*

Answer.—Mr. Cabrera's use of the words "temporal power" is a fine example of his dishonesty. He knows that, by the words "temporal power," most people mean the possession by the Holy See of the old Papal States. This gentleman uses it to mean that no Church or religious institution should be allowed to acquire or hold the land, buildings or investments necessary for carrying on its mission. Does England, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Austria, the United States, Italy, or even Russia, forbid Churches to have such possessions? Does even Turkey or China? They do not. Is it up to these countries to learn of the slaughtering, raping, stealing Constitutionalists of Mexico how to treat the institutions that stand for religion, and that are recognized as necessary to the very existence of nations?

CABRERA.—*The essence of the Laws of Reform regarding the Catholic Church consists in making it impossible for the clergy to hold real estate.*

Answer.—But why? The experience of the world shows that the Church can accomplish her mission under a union with the State, or free from such a union. If she is united to the State, then the State takes care of the temporalities, leaving to the Church her spiritual work. That situation is easily understood. If the Church is not united to the State, she is free, in every civilized nation except France, to have and to hold the property needed for her work. Mexico, emulating the worst of France's folly, wants no union of Church and State, but an enslavement of the Church by the State. Her Constitutionalists now desire to go farther. They want a dead Church in a live State. Why? The answer is easy. There is a class in Mexico that believes the country owes them a living. They are the lazy political class, fomenters of revolutions when out of power, grafters when in power. To these, in power or out, the principles of Christian morality are unalterably opposed. So much the worse, then, for the principles of Christian morality. There can be no truce. The Church may be discreetly silent on some things for the sake of the poor people; but she can not suppress the Ten Commandments. Every sermon against theft is an offense. Every act of deference to legitimate authority is a blow at the supposed right of revolution. Every act of popular piety is bitter though silent reproach. The grafter's son at his First Communion, his little girl coming home with her "holy pictures" from school, the very innocence of these, his children, fills him with rage against an institution which he knows, deep in his heart, is a constant invitation to honesty, and, therefore, a constant menace to himself. This is the why and the wherefore of the Laws of Reform. This is the reason

that Mr. Cabrera has for saying that they must be maintained. He hasn't yet secured all he wants. But when he desires to protect and care for his own family, he sends them to a religious institution — but away from the Mexico his friends have made.

CABRERA.— *These difficulties made the Church find another way of holding her property without trespassing, apparently, the Laws of Reform. . . . All confiscations against the Church are lawful.*

Answer.— Of course. It is well understood. If the Church finds a way to live within the law intended to kill her, the course of the Constitutionals is plain: the laws must be changed so as to make that life impossible. A law-abiding clergy is something that can not be tolerated for an instant. If the law is so that they can exist without disobeying it, what excuse is there to oppress and kill the clergy? It is all clear. *Que voulez vous?*

CABRERA.— *The fixing of the number of temples required for religious service ought to be made by the Church; but since the Catholic clergy in Mexico exerts an absolute government in religious matters . . . there is no basis to determine the number of temples needed in each city and town. The State is therefore the only capable power to agree with the Church as to the number of temples.*

Answer.— In one breath Mr. Cabrera demands separation of Church and State and in the next asserts that the State should even dictate the number of temples the people may build and occupy. That is why the Constitutionals closed *all* the churches in Toluca, and all but *one* in many of the most populous towns and cities, even going so far as to allow but *one* service on *one* day of the week, forbidding all other religious ministrations, and allowing but *one* priest to officiate, who usually was the oldest and most feeble, so that there might be a possible chance that the one selected would be physically unable to act. Comment is unnecessary.

CABRERA.— *Up to this time the Government has not used such a right (the "right" to take over the churches). Some time after the publication of the Laws of Reform — especially after 1857 — the Government of Juarez took some of the many temples existing in some cities to use them for public needs.*

Answer.— Which of these statements, diametrically in opposition, does Mr. Cabrera intend the public shall believe? Why did the State take these buildings? Mr. Cabrera says that it was because the Church had too many for the use of the people. But he also said that ninety-nine per cent of the people are Catholic. Then, surely, there were not too many temples for them.

CABRERA.—*Vera Cruz is a town whose average population is 50,000, and yet three churches are enough for its religious needs.*

Answer.—We Americans are not supposed to be a strikingly pious people, yet the little country town of 4,000 inhabitants in which I happened to be the Catholic pastor for thirteen years, had eight churches. Vera Cruz evidently is not as good as its name, and strikingly proves that Mr. Carranza selected his seat of government wisely. Is the new rule to be one temple for each 17,000 people? Are all the others to be confiscated and turned over to the “faithful” Carranzistas for purchase at a nominal price? There will be rejoicing, of a certainty. But the dives of Paris are closed since the war, and France, the mother of Mexican irreligion, is changing. By the way, Mr. Cabrera says that only real estate and investments are subject to confiscation. Perhaps science and learning may then rejoice in the return of the confiscated archeological library and museum of Archbishop Plancarte. (And again, by the way, Mr. Cabrera ought to know where that library is.) But that is too much to expect. Even if the people build the churches they think they need, and sustain them out of their devotion and poverty because they want them, Mr. Cabrera warns them that the State may not agree with them, but may proceed to confiscate their property for the benefit of its faithful grafters. But it was a mighty small thing in a Minister of Finance to steal a poor bishop’s books.

CABRERA.—*In 1874 the beneficent orders so-called “Sisters of Charity” were suppressed and the expulsion of all other orders, especially that of the Jesuits, was finished. The suppression of religious orders in Mexico was a measure taken to defend human liberty.*

Answer.—And then education for the Indians and peons died. It’s easier to handle them, you see, when the “faithful” need a revolution, if they are ignorant; and in the horror and misery of war, it might make the poor dying soldier think of God, if there was a Sister of Charity by to soothe his poor wounded body, when the soul is passing out of it. But there are Sisters in Spain, so Mr. Cabrera sends his family to them for the safety he can not find in Mexico.

CABRERA.—*It is absolutely false that some nuns have been made the victims of outrages of Constitutionalist soldiers.*

Answer.—Sworn statements to the contrary notwithstanding. Is this Mr. Cabrera’s reasoning? The Laws of Reform suppressed all religious orders. Nuns are members of religious orders. Therefore, there were no nuns, and, therefore, nuns were not victims of outrages. Those who were victims (and there were thousands and thousands of women out-

raged) were just women. The Constitutionalist soldiers were patriots. Patriots have rights. Women have none. There is no God, anyhow. What's the use?

CABRERA.—*The said laws (of reform) answer a peculiar condition of Latin America.*

Answer.—Which are not found necessary in prosperous Costa Rica, Brazil, Argentina and Chile, but are found “necessary” in the more degenerate graft-ridden republics of Latin America. But as Mexico, under her multitude of revolutions, has become the worst of all, when she should be the best, given the good people she has and her natural riches, she has sunk the lowest in her legislation and in her leaders.

CABRERA.—*The Constitutionalist Government intends in the meantime to uphold the separation of Church and State; and, therefore, it must not be wondered at if it takes all necessary steps to despoil the Catholic clergy of the temporal power they want to reacquire, or if it declares that no religious institution shall organize any political body, or if it proceeds to the confiscation of such estates as those which illegally exist in the hands of the Church, or which, even held by private persons, may be proved to be giving their income to the Church.*

Answer.—A careful perusal and study of the above is commended to all American citizens without regard to their religious views. Remembering that by “temporal power” Mr. Cabrera means the right to hold property and investment securities, here is how the Constitutionalist plan for Mexican “liberty” works out:

1st. There are Protestant schools and missions in Mexico. Under the Constitutionalist plan these would be treated like the Catholic Church, and growth would be forever impossible; for not only could the missions own nothing themselves in the way of temples (since the State takes all such buildings and only *permits* the real owners to occupy those the said State thinks they need), but the denominations could hold no building for their school-work, no club for their children, no library or Sunday-school buildings, not even land for playgrounds.

2d. Since the aim of all missionary work is to make each mission not only self-supporting, but also a new source of missionary energy later on, the Protestant missions in Mexico would always be operated with the real aim eliminated; for the missions could receive no bequest, no gift of land or of securities for their work. They could have no houses for the management of their own missionary enterprises. Their power of expansion would be absolutely nil, and their work would forever remain under the support and direction of foreign founders. An American could help in

life or in death, by gift or bequest, provided the gift or bequest was not kept in Mexico in the shape of real estate or securities. If it was sent there it could be confiscated at once.

3d. If the anti-religious laws are not to be enforced against Protestants, but are solely directed against Catholics, what sort of "liberty" is that which proscribes ninety-nine per cent of the population?

4th. The basic command of the Founder of Christianity to His Church was to "teach all nations." Mexico, by depriving the Church of the right to hold the means of support for her missions, would change this into "teach no nation."

5th. Not only does the Constitutionalist plan propose to make it impossible for the Church — or any Protestant denomination — to hold the means to carry on its missionary activities in pagan lands, but it likewise proposes to make it impossible for it to do anything for the eighty-five per cent of Indians at home. No Mexican dares give any real property or securities, or money for investment, for the purpose of erecting schools or charitable institutions among these poor people. Consequently, the missions for the Indians, who can not support the work themselves, must remain abandoned, as they are for that same reason to-day. The fifty years of the operation of the Laws of Reform have left the stamp of ignorance and lawlessness on the poor, neglected Indians.

6th. No clergyman of the Catholic Church, or of any Protestant denomination, could feel safe even in keeping his private means in the shape of investments for his old age in Mexico, or even the patrimony of his family; since a rigid investigation could be made by anti-religious officials, with the same kind of judges to pass upon the findings, to the end that the holding might be found to "illegally exist in the hands of the Church, *or even held by private persons.*" That this is no impossible idea of my own, is proven by the fact that in one case known to me, the last will and testament of a bishop was taken so as to discover what he privately possessed; and his entire life's savings and private patrimony — 19,000 pesos — were confiscated as belonging in reality to the Church, therefore, to the Constitutionlists. This is only one case that came under my personal knowledge; but, as a matter of fact, there are also many others. What thus becomes of the rights of free citizens?

7th. Any number of men, in order to bring odium and the charge of law-breaking on a religious institution, may use the name of the institution for that of a political party and, without any coöperation by the institution's leaders, bring them into disrepute and dishonor; they having no legal standing before the law and, therefore, being unable to protect themselves.

8th. The laws that thus proscribe religious institutions and forbid them even corporate existence before the courts of the State, would not proscribe lodges of anarchists, socialistic societies, or in fact anything but the organizations that work for morality and religion.

9th. In Mexico, therefore, there could be no institutions like the Universities of Yale (Presbyterian), Wesleyan (Methodist), Chicago (Baptist), any more than like Georgetown (Catholic) or Harvard (endowed by individual generosity); for the State alone must have a monopoly of education, as well as the right and duty to suppress religion.

How do you like this picture, my Protestant brother who is shouting that "the Catholic Church got what she deserved in Mexico," in spite of the fact that for two full generations the Catholic Church has had to exist under these very restrictions? Do you think that a ninety-nine per cent Protestant population would survive two generations of such laws? Do you think that Catholics in Mexico were law-breakers, as Mr. Cabrera charges, when they patiently turned the other cheek and refused to rise and spill the blood of these petty tyrants? Wouldn't you naturally say that religious freedom under a stranger ruler was better than religious slavery under native-born devils? Well, the Catholic Church didn't do any of these things. She headed no revolutions, but condemned them all, as she did the one against Madero at Zamora. She knew that he who "takes the sword will perish by the sword." She attempted no retaliation. The chief charge against her to-day is that she would not foster revolution, even when headed by her own priests. And she stands to-day charged with what? Peace, nursing the sick, caring for the fatherless, instructing the ignorant, visiting the afflicted, soothing the pillow of the dying, feeding the poor, uplifting the Indian, preaching the gospel, administering the Sacraments. Mr. Cabrera says that the Church obeyed the laws under the long reign of General Diaz, yet now he wants to kill her. Had she disobeyed them his demand would have been the very same.

As I read and commented on the extraordinary "reply" of this gentleman, I wondered if he and his friends ever really thought of how ridiculous they are in the eyes of honest people; how strangely like a band of unthinking savages they appear to those who are accustomed to the ways of civilization; how utterly without common sense they stand in the estimation of enlightened men and women of the twentieth century. If he had a cause to plead, he has utterly failed to give even a probability, nor even a possibility, to its existence. If by such a statement as he has made, he wished to "answer" the charges of "The Book of Red and Yellow" in a way that might win his friends some sympathy from those who do not agree with the Catholic Church, he has effectually destroyed

his chances by conceding the truth of every charge, and attempting to justify crimes by proving that his very laws, the laws of a Republic, are themselves crimes against justice, liberty, and the most basic rights of man. To free his chiefs and himself from the charge of murder, he quaintly urges that some one said "Boo" to them. To justify wholesale robbery by some degenerate Mexicans, he urges that all Mexico is a degenerate in the family of the nations. To excuse the most outrageous of tyrannies, he coolly lays the flag of sacred liberty over the slain, forgetting that it will quickly absorb the blood beneath, and change all its bright colors of hope into the red smudge of anarchy and destruction.

Does humanity tramp the road of oppression and expect it to end in the paradise of liberty? Does Mr. Cabrera dream that sane men will grant that insanity is its own cure? Does he think that Mexico will some day say, with the stench of his rotting victims still polluting the air, with the hunger cries of her starving children still ringing in her ears, with her eyes still sore at the sight of her ruins, that she paid not overmuch for the privilege of exchanging one set of governmental grafters for another set, who added murder, rape and sacrilege to the original crimes against her?

You have led your country on the way of irreligion, Citizen Cabrera. What have you to show her for it? The old curse of the Godless. History is only repeating itself. Man learns only to forget; but God resents being left out of human calculations by leaving humans to calculate alone. He needs do no more to punish them. The pagans said: "Whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad." They were wrong. Whom the gods wish to destroy, they leave to the advice and counsel of such as Luis Cabrera — and the bitter end is swift, sure and despairing.

An Open Letter to American Masons

There has been published in an American Masonic journal called the *New Age*, a letter from José Castellot, Past Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council of the Masons of Mexico, which has been copied by several other Masonic papers. It is quite evident that the article is published with the approval of the editors of American Masonic journals; and they seem to take it for granted that it will meet with approval by the members of the craft in the United States.

It is, perhaps, not unnatural that American Masons seek to lay the case for Mexican Masonry before their brethren. No one could object to that. But, since we are constantly assured that American Masons have no affiliation with the Latin or infidel type, does it seem as if such publication will have the effect of allaying suspicion and increasing good will? There are so many good men in the ranks of Masonry in the United States, so many men who have been constantly and consistently friendly to their Catholic fellow citizens, so many men whose honesty is without question, that many Catholics are prone to judge the attitude of Masons in this country toward their Church, by the men they meet, rather than by the things they hear.

But, to-day it is an open and known fact, that almost every Masonic publication is in the hands of anti-Catholics, and that Masonic publications are, in a mild form, doing the same work of bigotry as the filthy *Menace* and its ilk. Members of the craft whom we have always looked upon as fair-minded men, high in the esteem of all, while perhaps in the great majority among Masons, have nevertheless allowed those who speak for them to misrepresent their personal views. Masonic journals seem to want to bring American Masonry into line with the atheistic lodges that have taken such a bloody toll of Catholic lives in Portugal and in Mexico.

I speak under correction, for I want to be fair, to be honest in dealing with this question. It is serious, and it is destined to become more serious. We are in the midst of religious strife, which Catholics have not invited. We believe that the majority of Masons do not want it, but how can we help thinking that there is danger of its becoming greater when we read in a Masonic journal such articles as those of Señor Castellot? I still believe, however, that fair-minded American Masons will give the truth a hearing; so for that reason I am addressing this open letter to them as well as to the ex-Grand Commander.



If the Señor lived up to some of the solemn declarations in the opening of his article, I would not invite a quarrel with him. He "stands

squarely for religious liberty," he says, and he "pledges his honor as a Mason" to that. He asserts that his heart "goes out to those who are wronged." He demands the punishment of those who are guilty of atrocities. He raises his voice "in protest before the tribunal of universal justice, regardless of the creed involved." He calls the outrages against Catholic priests and nuns "unspeakable." He refers in this connection to "the looting of their treasuries, the profanation of their temples, the ravishing of their bodies and the desecration of their most sacred objects." All this sounds good. The door by which he may escape is a small one; but it is convenient. Let me point it out: "At the same time," he says, "I strive and struggle to uphold human liberty, whenever any religion attempts to strangle it" — the implication being that the Catholic Church in Mexico having attempted to strangle human liberty, those who committed these unspeakable outrages went perhaps a little too far, but had excuses. Now human liberty is a big thing; and it has a great cause. But is it a bigger thing than religious liberty? Frankly I fail to see how Señor Castellot can reconcile offenses against religious liberty while he is struggling for human liberty. Where is the distinction? Still I give him credit for sincerity. I always try to give every opponent credit for that. So if I point out to him where he is wrong, will he accept my correction kindly? I think he will, for I must think so, since I credit him with being sincere. All right then, here is some part of the other side:

Señor Castellot charges that the Catholic Church is warring against Masonry. The Catholic Church wars against Masonry to this extent: that it forbids her members to be Masons, for the very obvious reason that Masonry is a religion and is so considered by Masonic writers. The Catholic Church believes that the Catholic Church is the pillar and ground of truth. She stands, therefore, in opposition to all doctrines which are opposed to her own teachings. Thus, for example, she is in opposition to Protestantism, to Mohammedism, or any other ism that is in fundamental opposition to her. The Democratic party is in opposition to the Republican party, and both are in opposition to the Progressive party. All of them, however, manage to live together as citizens without breaking one another's heads. No one seriously thinks that a Catholic can be a member of the Methodist Church at the same time that he is a member of the Catholic Church. Fundamentally, our quarrel with Masons in this country is the same, and fair-minded Masons recognize that fact. We oppose Latin Masonry for the same reason that American Masons refuse to recognize it — because it is a propagator of revolution and infidelity.

Now, has the Catholic Church in Mexico, as charged by Señor Castellot, attempted to destroy human liberty? I merely turn to the Laws of Mex-

ico, cite them, and there is the answer. Here is a summary I recently compiled, of the anti-Catholic laws that have been on the statute books of Mexico for fifty years:

"When the Revolution came, and with it the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez, an end came also to what little freedom the Church had. She was despoiled of such possessions as had been left her. She was forbidden to teach, which means to open schools of any kind, except of theology. Her ministers even could not dress as clerics. The law of May 13, 1873, forbade any religious demonstration outside of a church building, and forbade clergymen or Sisters to dress in any way that would indicate their calling. The Constitution of 1857 interfered with personal liberty to the extent of forbidding anybody to enter a religious order, and refused religious orders a legal right to hold property. The law of July 12, 1859, suppressed religious orders and religious societies, forbade the foundation of new congregations, ordered all books, manuscripts, prints and antiquities belonging to such orders to be given up. The law of February 26 suppressed female communities. The law of July 12, 1859, took away all property from the clergy; but that of February 5, 1861, returned to the Church its parochial residences, bishops' houses, etc. Then September 25, 1873, saw a new law which forbade any religious institution to acquire property or the revenue derived from it. The law of December 14, 1874, struck at the right of the clergy to receive legacies. The law of July 31, 1859, took away from the clergy the right to manage or have anything to do with cemeteries. The law of February 2, 1861, took from the Church her hospitals and charitable institutions, as also did a law of February 28 of the same year. To make it more certain that the Church would not be charitable, the law of August 27, 1904, forbade clergymen to act as directors and administrators, or patrons of private charities, and extended this decree even to include those delegated by clergymen. It will clearly be seen that, under the Constitution and Laws of Reform, the clergy had little power left, and the Church little chance to uplift the people."

These are the actual laws; yet Señor Castellot says that, for the last ten years especially, Catholics have been waging a war against religious freedom. If we have been waging such a war, how has it been manifested, since we have not even changed the laws against ourselves?

What then have we been doing for the last ten years that is so reprehensible? Señor Castellot says we worked "wholly regardless of the means employed." He outlines what these means were. He says we made an alliance with the "Científicos," and we worked through the home. With what "Científicos" did we make an alliance? Señor Castellot himself states that the leader of the "Científicos," President Diaz,

was himself a fellow member of the Supreme Council of Masonry. Señor Castellot, on the authority of John Kenneth Turner, was himself a "Científico." Did we then work with Masons? He states also that the "Científicos" were in power and "controlled the will of the President." Surely, then a number of Catholics were in the Diaz cabinets. Yet during the Presidency of Diaz there is scarcely a Catholic to be found on the list of Mexican officials. In the latter years of the Diaz Administration, there is one — de la Barra. During the Administration of President Madero, which is praised by Señor Castellot, there was one more — Lascourain. Yet Mexico is a Catholic country; in fact, overwhelmingly Catholic. But there have been fewer Catholics in the cabinets of Mexico than there have been in the cabinets of Presidents of the United States. Señor Castellot knows that this condition not only applied to the cabinets, but to the courts, and, in fact, to the legislatures and to the senates. Does this indicate that the Church was meddling in politics? Surely if she had been doing that, she would have seen to it that she had some representation in the government of the nation.

But why should the Church be so anxious to bring about the fall of Madero? He gave Mexico what was the nearest approach to a fair and honest election ever attempted under the Republic. Under Madero the Catholic Church looked forward, for the first time since Juarez, to a hope for religious liberty for her own children. Señor Castellot and those who believe him are laboring under the impression that the Catholic party, established with the encouragement of Madero, was fighting for something to which Catholics were not entitled. Read over again the summary of the Laws of Reform. The Catholic party simply wanted to change them. Señor Castellot, according to his own principles, ought to have helped them, for he says very beautifully that he believes in religious liberty. There would have been no Catholic party in Mexico had the Catholics had even a semblance of liberty. There need not have been any fighting or quarreling on the subject, if Masons in Mexico had been willing to throw their strength toward securing that precious boon. It was all Catholics asked for.

The Señor asserts that another reprehensible means taken by the Church in its struggle was to influence the home. Again let me appeal to honesty. Since Catholics were denied religious liberty, why should they not try to exert every legitimate influence possible in an effort to gain it? Is there any reason why a man should not be influenced by his home? Is there anything more sacred to him, outside of his duty to God? Is there anything that gives him more happiness, more peace of mind, more solace in affliction, and more encouragement in trouble? Has his wife no rights which he is bound to respect? Must she bear his children

in pain, and bring them up in love and labor, yet have nothing to say about them? Should she permit a husband to banish every bit of religious consolation she has? Women are naturally more religious than men. Their sensitive natures require more religious solace than men think they themselves need. Is it not fair that the family be considered a unit? While the man speaks, under the laws of Mexico, for his family, surely that family must have some influence on what he says. Where are there more beautiful and satisfactory homes than those under the influence of the Catholic Church? Where is there more purity in the family life? Where, therefore, is there a better influence on the morality of any people? Señor Castellot's idea seems to be that the "lord and master" has the right to persecute everything that his wife and children hold dear, and that they must not open their mouths in protest or attempt to defend that which is their joy and consolation. Is this common sense? If the Señor can prove that the Catholic religion of a wife is an injury to her husband and a destruction to the home, he can do something that no other writer would even have the temerity to attempt.



You say, Señor, that the Church "kept amassing and enjoying riches, and kept counselling humility while exercising tyranny." In the name of fair play, tell your fellow Masons in America what riches the Church had. You mention prelates and dignitaries "clothed in vestments of gold and crowned with mitres studded with diamonds and rubies, symbolizing the tears and blood of the faithful." I am pretty confident, Señor, that if I took the diamonds and the rubies out of all the mitres owned by a Mexican bishop, you would very carefully examine them before agreeing to exchange them for the gold, diamonds and rubies possessed by your own wife and daughters, if you have any. I never in my life, and I am twenty years a priest, saw a gold mitre studded with diamonds and rubies. They exist, but so do polar bears — somewhere else. The episcopal rings on the fingers of the Mexican bishops I saw would not average in value \$25 each. The vestments used in ecclesiastical ceremonies are like the robes of your lodges — chiefly tinsel; and the precious stones are usually cut glass. We have too much to do with money for charity and missions to buy these things with it. There are, it is true, some old and valuable vestments in Mexico, mostly the gifts of wealthy people; but who owns them? Why, the State, since the State took everything and claims everything. Who owns the Churches, built by the piety of the old Spaniards and very often through the free labor contributed by the faithful people? The State. Who profited when these Churches and other religious institutions were sold? Not the Church, for she was simply robbed, but private individuals. Look at the fortunes that were founded for some of

your faithful "liberals," some of the very "Científicos" you say we influenced. What about the Limantour fortune; but the Limantours are only *one* family that grew rich on the robbery. Was he a Mason? You know, Señor, that when Juarez robbed the Church to benefit the State, how much the State did not benefit, but you know who *did* benefit; and you know that in many a Mexican lodge to-day are the descendants of the men who owe their private fortunes to thefts from the Catholic Church. Why conceal these things from American Masons? You want their sympathy, why not tell them the truth? They'll honor you for that at least.

Where are the riches of the Church? Are they in the churches? But the churches are not ours. Are they in lands? But the Church has no right to hold lands. Are they in private investments held in the name of others? But your laws confiscate such things by an unjust inheritance tax in three transfers. Personally, I know but one rich Mexican bishop, but his wealth came from his father's estate. How much do the Mexican clergy receive in salaries? You know, my dear Señor, that they receive very much less than Protestant clergymen receive here in the United States; and that while many of them live in poverty none live in affluence. What do the people give to them? In Mexico they give the smallest possible coin, because it is the poor who support religion in Mexico as in every other country, and the little sacrifice they make would not amount to 25 cents a year for each worshiper. You know all this. Everybody in Mexico knows. Why leave your Masonic brethren in the United States under the supposition that the Church is wringing money out of the people to support her clergy in luxury and wealth, when you know we have no luxury and you know we have no wealth; when you took all we had, when you closed our schools, stole our monasteries, colleges and universities, and ended up by outraging our nuns and shooting our priests? If, for fair play's sake you will not tell the truth, will you do it for the sake of that Heaven you invoke so piously and which, I presume, you hope some day to reach — if there happens to be one, a fact, which, I presume, you doubt.

Then why, Señor, do you speak of the "general unrest," and intimate that the Revolution was a rising of all the people, especially the poor? You know that the people of Mexico never had a chance to vote, never had an honest election, and that even the attempted honesty under Madero was a failure. You know that the officials, not Catholics, but many of them Masons, manipulated the ballots to suit themselves. You know that entire haciendas were voted as a unit, and as the *Jefe Politico* directed. You know that the Revolutionist army does not represent the people of Mexico. If it does, why did they take the arms away from the people, debase the coinage and suppress the newspapers? You know that the

people are pious and good, and that they want their Church and their religious ceremonies. You know that they still speak of the days when they could have their religious processions and worship God in the open. You know that if a poll were taken of Mexico to-day, that there would not be a Revolutionist allowed to remain in the country, and that the Church would have back her freedom; and you know that a minority which controlled the power, because it controlled the army, has imposed its will upon the people of Mexico for fifty years. Why not tell these things to your Masonic brethren in America, and let them get a fair idea of just exactly what the situation is?

But you say that you were "familiar with all the inner history of events," and you say, too, that "Masonry laid the foundation of its patriotic and disinterested work, in open fight, as was to be expected, against the powerful interests already created." This is an acknowledgment that Mexican Masonry did actually interfere in politics and openly fought against the Catholic Church. But the insistence here has been that Masonry is purely a fraternal organization, which had nothing to do with politics. American Masons believe that, and yet, telling them that such is not the case, you still ask for sympathy. You rail against the "Científicos," who were all Masons and few of whom were even nominally Catholics. You speak of their overthrowing the "whole economic system and upsetting the national credit." For Heaven's sake, where is the national credit to-day? Where is the money that Diaz himself left in the treasury? It was there when he went away, but it was not there when Huerta came into power. You say that the clergy would not "sacrifice the power which afforded them the means to carry out the works of charity begun." Under the laws where did they have the power? And why should they be called upon to sacrifice the means that might have been given them for such a purpose? Would any Mason in the United States ask hospitals to sacrifice endowments, or the churches to sacrifice their missionary funds? Then why ask American Masons to approve for Mexico what they would not dream of asking in the United States?

You certainly tell the truth, Señor, when you say that the revolution "incited by passion or spurred on by sordid interests has degenerated into the worst form of anarchy, whose end no one can predict." All that is perfectly true, but who brought on this anarchy? The same sordid interests, not represented by Masonry, but represented by men who used Masonry to promote their own selfish aims and purposes. It was pelf that the leaders wanted, and they knew those in power would give them that. They played fast and loose with the liberties of the people. They saw to it that laws were made to do away with religious liberty. They

deliberately stole the wealth that had been consecrated to religion and charity. In the name of "liberalism," they became the most illiberal of all men, and now wade knee-deep in blood. They whine out their complaints against the Church, and point to her, gagged and bound as they left her fifty years ago, to charge that she is responsible for the crimes for which they laid the foundation, and which are only a consequence of their own greed and lust. Why, Señor, for fifty years you have had Mexico in your hands, and is this what you have of it?

You say, let "the American Roman Catholic clergy allay its anger against Mexican Masonry and carefully weigh its attacks before making them, in order not to fall into untruth and exhibit itself before the public relying on theories and stories invented for the purpose." My dear Señor, are the Laws of Reform theories and stories? If they are, then the compilation of the laws of Mexico, which you made yourself, must be lies. We have cited your laws. We have pointed out only what these laws have effected. We have shown you clearly that you gave no religious liberty to Mexico. We have itemized in detail a few of the outrages committed, and which you yourself now say were committed. What stories have we told other than these? You are convicted out of your own mouth, not out of anything that we have said. But in order that you may see that we are fair, or rather that American Masons may see that we are fair, let us here and now make a proposition for consideration to you and your brethren, and to all the Liberals of Mexico for that matter, and see if you will consent to it:

Will you work to give to the Catholic Church in Mexico the same religious liberty that is enjoyed by the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Congregational Church, the Mormon Church, the Quaker Church, the Baptist Church, or any other church existing in the United States? Will you work to give to Catholic parents in Mexico, the same rights that Protestant parents have in this country, that Masonic parents have in this country? Americans think that this is religious liberty. American Masons think so. Do you think so? If you do, very well, pledge to try to get it for Mexico. If you don't, do us this favor at least: don't try to deceive your American brethren. Let them know just where you stand. Tell them you don't want religious liberty in Mexico, or you can not give it because if you do, the Church will be honored as she deserves, will receive back her stolen houses of worship, will reopen her schools and universities, will begin to lift those of your Indians that are now, because you killed our schools, in barbarism, and will teach your people the Ten Commandments, including this one: "Thou shalt not steal." We have an expressive saying, Señor, that covers your case: "Put up or shut up."

FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY.

KEEP POSTED ABOUT MEXICO

By reading the official paper of the
Catholic Church Extension Society—

Extension Magazine

SPREAD THE TRUTH AND
HELP THE CAUSE

by securing one new subscriber for
EXTENSION MAGAZINE

The High-Class
Illustrated Catholic Magazine

ONLY \$2.00 A YEAR

Extension Magazine, Drawer S, Chicago, Ill.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 833 525 6